DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 960 UD 025 517

AUTHOR Ashby, Glenn W.; And Others
TITLE ECIA, Chapter 1 1984-85 Final Evaluation Report. Dade County Public Schools.
INSTITUTION Dade County Public Schools, Miami, FL. Office of Educational Accountability.
PUB DATE Dec 85
NOTE 210p.; Pages i-iv are printed on colored paper.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Compensatory Education; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Elementary Secondary Education; Eligibility; Exceptional Persons; High Risk Students; *Individualized Education Programs; *Mathematics Instruction; Program Evaluation; *Reading Instruction; Remedial Programs; Supplementary Education
IDENTIFIERS *Dade County Public Schools FL; *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Stanford Achievement Tests

ABSTRACT

This report presents program evaluation findings on the 1984-85 Chapter 1 project in the Dade County (Florida) School District. The project sought to raise the reading, mathematics and language performance levels of low achieving students at schools with high concentrations of children from low income families. Achievement was assessed by score gains reported from the April 1984 and April 1985 administrations of the Stanford Achievement Test. Evaluation efforts also included monitoring the status of project operations through site visits, and a survey of Chapter 1 personnel and parents. Results showed that overall district public school reading and mathematics achievement gains were not substantial, but the project was generally successful. The reading gain was slightly higher than the mathematics gain. In both reading and mathematics, secondary grade level gains were greater than elementary grade level gains. Female reading achievement gains were higher than male gains at both the elementary and secondary levels. Mathematics gains were higher for females at the elementary levels and for males at the secondary levels. The report includes the following: (1) a description of the project; (2) a description of the evaluation; (3) a discussion of results; (4) conclusions and recommendations; and (5) appendices. These constitute the greater part of the report and provide lists of Chapter 1 schools, student selection criteria, descriptions of supplementary program models, individual school achievement test results, and copies of the surveys used. Thirty-three data tables are contained in the text. (PS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

5-7-87

ED281960

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

ECIA, CHAPTER I

1984-85

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Rusner

Dade County Public Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
PROGRAM EVALUATION DEPARTMENT

DECEMBER 1985

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

Mr. Robert Renick, Chairman
Dr. Kathleen B. Magrath, Vice-Chairman
Mr. G. Holmes Braddock
Mr. Paul Cejas
Dr. Michael Krop
Ms. Janet R. McAliley
Mr. William H. Turner

Dr. Leonard Britton
Superintendent of Schools

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
ECIA, CHAPTER 1
1984-1985

Principal Evaluators/Authors:

Glenn W. Ashby
Jerome L. Levitt, Ph.D.
Daysi H. Naya
Arlene Wardell

Dade County Public Schools
Office of Educational Accountability
1450 Northeast Second Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132

December 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose of Project 1

Background of ESEA, Title I and ECIA, Chapter 1 . . 1

Selection of Participating Schools 1

Selection of Eligible Students 1

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT 3

Schoolwide Component 3

Elementary Component 4

Chapter 1/SCE Component 4

Secondary School Component 5

Alternative School Component 5

Non-Public School Component 6

Center for Neglected or Delinquent Youth Component . 6

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION 7

Achievement Gains for 1984-85 7

Monitoring Activities 8

ECIA, Chapter 1 Personnel and Parent Survey 10

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 11

Achievement Gains for 1984-85 11

Public elementary schools 11

Public secondary schools 19

Public alternative schools 19

Non-public schools 19

Public schools 19

Administrative areas 29

Individual Schools 29

Monitoring Activities 45

ECIA, Chapter 1 Personnel and Parent Survey 46

Administrator survey 47

Elementary teacher survey 48

Secondary aide survey 49

Project manager survey 49

Area educational specialist survey 50

Parent survey 51

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 53

Achievement Gains for 1984-85 53

Monitoring Activities 54

ECIA, Chapter Personnel and Parent Survey 54

Recommendations 55

APPENDICES

A. ECIA, Chapter 1 Schools, 1984-85 57

B. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Student Selection Criteria 63

C. Supplementary Program Models 71

D. Explanation of Regression 85

E. Individual School Achievement Test Results 89

F. ECIA, Chapter 1 Survey Instruments With Results 131

LIST OF TABLES

1. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Number of Students Served by Component During the 1984-85 School Year 3

2. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Schoolwide Component Achievement Test Results by Subject - Average NCE Gains . 12

3. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Elementary School Component Achievement Test Results by Model Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 13

4. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Elementary School Component Achievement Test Results by Model Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 14

5. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Elementary School Component Average Test Results by Model Language - Average NCE Gains 15

6. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Chapter 1/SCE Component Achievement Test Results by Model Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 16

7. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Chapter 1/SCE Component Achievement Test Results by Model Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 17

8. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Chapter 1/SCE Component Achievement Test Results by Model Language - Average NCE Gains 18

9. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Secondary School Component Achievement Test Results by Model Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 20

10. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Secondary School Component Achievement Test Results by Model Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 21

11. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Alternative School Component Achievement Test Results by Model Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 22

12. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Alternative School Component Achievement Test Results by Model Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 23

13. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Non-Public School Component Achievement Test Results by Model Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 24

14. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Non-Public School Component Achievement Test Results by Model Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 25

15. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Public Schools
Achievement Test Results by Gender
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 26

16. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 District Schools
Achievement Test Results by Gender
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 27

17. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 District Schools
Achievement Test Results by Gender
Language - Average NCE Gains 28

18. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Schoolwide Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 30

19. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Schoolwide Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 31

20. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Schoolwide Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Language - Average NCE Gains 32

21. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Elementary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 33

22. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Elementary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 34

23. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Elementary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Language - Average NCE Gains 35

24. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Chapter 1/SCE Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 36

25. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Chapter 1/SCE Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 37

26. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Chapter 1/SCE Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Language - Average NCE Gains 38

27. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Secondary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 39

28. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Secondary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 40

29. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Alternative School Component Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 41

30. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Alternative School Component Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 42

31. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Non-Public School Component Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area Total Reading - Average NCE Gains 43

32. 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 Non-Public School Component Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains 44

33. ECIA, Chapter 1 Personnel and Parent Survey Number of Survey Forms Distributed and Returned 46

Executive Summary

This report presents program evaluation findings concerning the 1984-85 Chapter 1 project as it was implemented in the Dade County School District.

Federal funds totaling approximately $28 million were provided through Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981 (Public Law 97-35) for the implementation of the project. During the 1984-85 project year, services were provided to a total of 33,278 students at 177 sites.

A major revision of the public elementary school program was made at the beginning of the 1983-84 school year. These modifications, which were continued during 1984-85, included: (1) provision of services to eligible students during the regular school day, rather than through an after-school program; (2) development of a Schoolwide component in one elementary school; and (3) provision of Chapter 1 services through a Full-Day Basic Skills model in the Elementary component and the Chapter 1/SCE elementary component.

The objective of the project was to raise the reading, mathematics and language performance levels, relative to national norms, of low achieving students who attend schools with high concentrations of children from low income families. The major evaluation focus was an assessment of achievement made by the project students in areas of reading, mathematics and language as evidenced by NCE gain scores reported from April, 1984 and April, 1985 administrations of the Stanford Achievement Test.

In addition to the assessment of achievement gains, evaluation efforts included monitoring the status of project operations through site visitations, and a survey of Chapter 1 personnel and parents in order to gather data for use in developing and implementing compensatory educational programs in 1985-86.

Achievement Gains for 1984-85

While the overall district public school reading and mathematics achievement gains for 1984-85 are not substantial, it appears that the project was generally successful. With the exception of the second and fourth grades, positive gains in reading were achieved at all grade levels. The negative results at the second and fourth grades reflect districtwide achievement patterns and are reported by several other districts in the State that use the Stanford. Positive gains in mathematics were achieved at all grade levels except for a slight negative result in the fourth grade. Achievement results in language showed positive gains in grades five and six with a negative result at the fourth grade. Since any gain greater than zero would indicate that the Chapter 1 pupils had improved their standing with respect to the normative population, the overall public school results indicate that the Chapter 1 program had a generally positive effect on the participants' achievement.

The reported overall public school reading and mathematics achievement results for grades kindergarten through eleven would indicate that the Chapter 1 program was having a similar impact in both reading and mathematics. The overall reading gain is slightly higher than the overall mathematics gain, but it is not clear whether this is a program effect or the result of inflated reading gains in the secondary grades.

Most participants in the Elementary component and the Chapter 1/SCE elementary component received Chapter 1 services through the Full-Day Basic Skills model. A small number of students who could not be assigned to a Full-Day Basic Skills class received supplementary instruction through one of three contingency models (Staff Resource, Pullout, Extended School Day). An attempt was made to compare the achievement gains made by participants in the contingency models with the gains made by students who participated in the Full-Day Basic Skills model. Only in the Elementary component Staff Resource model did a sufficient number of students participate to allow such a comparison. In reading, participants in the Staff Resource model achieved a slightly higher gain than the Full-Day model participants, while in mathematics, the Full-Day participants achieved a greater gain than the Staff Resource students. It may be that these findings are not a result of differences in the models but rather a function of differences in the student populations due to factors at the school level that influence student placement.

Compared to the elementary grade level (K-6), the secondary grade level (7-11) gains were greater in both reading and mathematics. The secondary grade level reading gain is substantially greater than the elementary level reading gain score. The difference in mathematics gains, although not as substantial, is relatively large. However, the secondary level gains should be interpreted cautiously due to selection procedures which may have increased the regression effect on these gain scores.

Female reading achievement gains were higher than the male reading achievement gains overall as well as at the elementary level and the secondary level. Overall and elementary level mathematics achievement gains were greater for the female participants. However, at the secondary level the males achieved a greater NCE gain in mathematics than the female participants. Female students appeared to benefit more from participation in the Chapter 1 program than the male students except in mathematics at the secondary level.

Monitoring Activities

Data from both site visitation cycles revealed that, on the whole, the program was functioning smoothly. There were some problems which were reported to project personnel at conference sessions following each of the visitations.

ECIA, Chapter 1 Personnel and Parent Survey

Results of the survey indicate an overall high degree of program satisfaction across all six respondent groups. Principals reported that, in general, little difficulty was encountered in planning and implementing the Chapter 1 program. The Chapter 1 planning process and the adequacy and clarity of information provided to facilitate program planning received favorable ratings by most administrators. However, more than half of the principals reported that they experienced difficulty obtaining parental involvement in the planning of their program. Similarly, area educational specialists reported difficulty involving parents in the implementation of the program. A relatively large number of administrators also noted that they experienced problems in developing their program because of the late arrival of test scores used to determine student eligibility. Some principals reported problems implementing the Chapter 1 program because of difficulty experienced in recruiting suitable personnel.

The positive influence of the Chapter 1 program on student achievement was reported by administrators, teachers, educational specialists, and parents. The 16:1 student-teacher ratio used in the elementary schools Full-Day Basic Skills classes was rated as effective by virtually all teachers even though a high percentage indicated that having two teachers, with 16 students each, in a single regular-sized classroom was harmful to instruction. The vast majority of teachers, however, indicated that they preferred to remain in Chapter 1 during the next school year even if it were necessary to share a classroom.

Chapter 1 personnel were provided with an opportunity to indicate their desire and/or need for inservice training. Two general areas of inservice were noted most frequently. The need/desire for inservice in the area of computer education and computer software was reported by administrators, elementary teachers, and secondary aides. Responses from principals, teachers, and educational specialists also indicate the need/desire for additional inservice training in the area of the language experience approach and oral language development.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the Chapter 1 project, as implemented in the 1984-85 school year, be continued.

2. It is recommended that specific attention be given to the reading instruction at the second and fourth grades. It should be noted, however, that there also may be non-programmatic influences affecting reading test results at these grade levels.

3. It is recommended that additional emphasis be placed on mathematics in the fourth grade.

4. It is recommended that additional emphasis be placed on language development at the fourth grade level.

5. It is recommended that some attention should be given to those factors which influence the differential performance of male and female students at particular grades.

6. Additional effort should be made to identify methods to further involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Chapter 1 project.

7. Attention should be given to the difficulty that principals experience in recruiting suitable teachers and aides.

8. The situation in which two teachers, each with 16 students, teach in a single regular-sized classroom should be reviewed in order to determine if adjustments can be made to reduce the negative effects resulting from this situation.

9. The inservice needs/desires of Chapter 1 personnel should be identified and appropriate inservice training provided. Survey data indicated a need for inservice training in the areas of computer education, computer software, language experience, and oral language development.

INTRODUCTION

This document reports the evaluation findings concerning the 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 project operated by the Dade County Public Schools. The findings are based on the achievement test results obtained from promoted students who were participants of the project for the academic year 1984-85.

Purpose of Project

The project's general aim was the provision of supplementary instructional programming in the basic skills at the elementary school level and in reading and mathematics at the secondary level. These skill development services were to be provided in sufficient strength to counter educational handicaps stemming from conditions associated with low socio-economic areas.

Background of ESEA, Title I and ECIA, Chapter 1

In 1965, the United States Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in an effort to improve the quality of education in the United States. Title I of this Act provided federal funds for supplementary instruction for low achieving students who attended schools with the highest concentrations of children from low-income families. Effective with the 1982-83 school year, ESEA, Title I was replaced by the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA), Chapter 1 (Public Law 97-35). Under this Act the Title I program purpose of supplementary instruction in the basic skills for low achieving students in low-income communities has been continued.

Selection of Participating Schools

The percentage of students eligible for free and/or reduced lunches in a given school is used to determine the eligibility of that school for participation in the Chapter 1 program. All schools, in which the percentage of children eligible for free and/or reduced lunch is higher than the districtwide average, are eligible for the Chapter 1 program (elementary, junior, and senior high schools are analyzed separately). From among the eligible schools, selection for participation is generally made in economic rank order (highest percentage = highest ranking). The number of schools to be selected for participation is controlled by the program cost per pupil, the number of eligible pupils in each school, and the total available funding. A list of the 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 schools can be found in Appendix A.

Selection of Eligible Students

The ECIA, Chapter 1 statute and related guidelines define any student who is achieving below the norm for his/her age and grade as "educationally disadvantaged". Such a population was much too large to serve effectively with the funding which was available under ECIA, Chapter 1. Consequently, the selection of students

for participation in the Chapter 1 program was based on the need to concentrate resources on as many of the educationally disadvantaged students as possible without jeopardizing the scope and quality of the program which was planned. Several factors were included in the process of defining the population on which the Chapter 1 resources were concentrated. Among these factors were costs per pupil for the proposed program design, total available funding, grade level priorities, instructional priorities, student achievement characteristics, and available resources from other programs. The specific student selection criteria for the 1984-85 Chapter 1 program can be found in Appendix B.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

During the 1984-85 academic year, Chapter 1 funds were allocated to 106 elementary, 28 middle/junior high, 14 senior high, and 6 alternative public schools in Dade County. In addition, funds were provided to nine non-public schools and 14 centers for neglected or delinquent youth. The project funding totaled approximately $28 million and provided services for 33,278 eligible students through seven project components. Presented in Table 1 is the number of students served by each of the seven project components.

Table 1

1984-85, ECIA, Chapter 1
Number of Students Served by Component
During the 1984-85 School Year

Component	No. of Sites	Grade Levels	No. of Students Served
Schoolwide	4	K-6	2,768
Elementary	67	1-6	14,560
Chapter 1/SCE	35	1-6	1,935
Secondary School	42	5-10	11,907
Alternative	6	6-12	836
Non-Public	9	1-8	605
Neglected/Delinquent	14	K-12	667
Total	177	K-12	33,278

Schoolwide Component

During the 1984-85 school year instruction was provided in self-contained classrooms with a student-teacher ratio of 16:1 to all students, grades kindergarten through sixth, enrolled in the four public elementary schools with the highest percentages of students eligible for free or reduced price lunches. Chapter 1 funds were allocated for each student whose prior reading and mathematics achievement levels were between the 1st through the 49th percentiles. Regular state and local funds (Budget, Part 1) were allocated for those students whose prior reading and/or mathematics achievement levels were at or above the 50th percentile. Chapter 1 supplementary funding was provided for a total of 2,768 students in this component.

All students received instruction from certified elementary teachers in all curriculum areas based on individual student needs. Although instruction was not limited to basic skills, teachers were encouraged to provide parallel emphasis on the mastery of basic skills in conjunction with instruction in other learning areas. Students were instructed for the entire school day in accordance with the district's "Balanced Curriculum" instructional time requirements.

Elementary Component

Students in grades one through six in the sixty-seven schools with the highest economic ranking, exclusive of the four schoolwide component sites, participated in the Elementary component. Students were eligible for participation in the program if their prior achievement levels were at or below the 20th percentile in reading and the 49th percentile in mathematics. Supplementary funding for this component was provided exclusively by Chapter 1.

Eligible students were enrolled in Full-Day Basic Skills classes with a student-teacher ratio no greater than 16:1. Approximately one-half of the school day was devoted to individualized instruction in reading, language arts, and mathematics using a diagnostic/prescriptive approach. The remainder of the day included basic skills instruction through content areas (science, social studies, health and safety, and literature and expressive language) and instruction from specialists in physical education, music, art and other special electives.

A limited number of eligible students who could not be assigned to a Full-Day Basic Skills class due to parent requests, scheduling, space and/or staff availability limitations, received supplementary instruction in basic skills through one of three contingency models (Staff Resource, Pullout, Extended School Day). In the Staff Resource model, Chapter 1 aides/assistants provided basic skills instruction to Chapter 1 students under the direction and supervision of the locally-funded teacher in the regular classroom. The Pullout model supplementary services were provided by Chapter 1 funded personnel (teachers or aides) in specifically designated areas outside the regular classroom during the regular school day. The Extended School Day model allowed Chapter 1 funded teachers to provide basic skills instruction to Chapter 1 eligible students in pre or post school hours. A complete description of the supplementary program models is included in Appendix C. A total of 14,560 students received services under this component including those students enrolled in the Staff Resource, Pullout, and Extended School Day models.

Chapter 1/SCE Component

The remaining 35 public elementary school sites included in the 1984-85 Chapter 1 project used Chapter 1 and State Compensatory Education (SCE) program funds jointly to provide supplemental

instruction to eligible students in the first through sixth grades. Chapter 1 funds were allocated for students whose prior achievement levels were between the 16th through 20th percentiles in reading in conjunction with the 49th percentile or below in mathematics. SCE funds were allocated for students whose prior reading achievement levels were within the 1st through the 15th percentiles in reading and the 49th percentile or below in mathematics.

Instructional services were provided without regard to Chapter 1 or SCE program distinctions using the Full-Day Basic Skills model described in the Elementary component. A limited number of students who could not be served in this model were provided supplementary instruction through the contingency models (Staff Resource, Pullout, Extended School Day) as described in the Elementary component. Chapter 1 supplementary funding was provided for a total of 1,935 students in this component, including the students served through the Staff Resource, Pullout, and Extended School Day models.

Secondary School Component

Chapter 1 reading and mathematics services were provided to students in grades five through ten at 42 public secondary schools (28 middle/junior high, 14 senior high). Students were eligible to receive services if their prior achievement level was at the first or second stanine. Separate eligibility was determined for reading and mathematics.

Two Chapter 1 supplementary models were used to provide services to eligible students: Split Laboratory/Classroom and Staff Resource. The most commonly used model was the Staff Resource in which Chapter 1 funded paraprofessionals, under the direction and supervision of locally funded teachers, provided instruction to Chapter 1 eligible students in classrooms which were composed of either Chapter 1 students only or both Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1 students. Limited usage was also made of the Split Laboratory/Classroom model in which Chapter 1 and locally funded teachers were paired for the purpose of providing instruction to Chapter 1 eligible students in separate classrooms. A detailed description of the Secondary School component program models is provided in Appendix C. A total of 11,907 students received 8,766 reading services and 7,201 mathematics services through this component.

Alternative School Component

Public alternative school students (grades 6-12) were eligible to participate in the Chapter 1 program if their prior achievement levels were at or below the 25th percentile in reading and/or mathematics and they otherwise would have been attending Chapter 1 schools. Supplementary instruction was provided to eligible students through Homogeneous Laboratory/Classroom, Split Laboratory/Classroom, and Staff Resource models (as described in the Secondary School component) and the Pullout model (elementary

grades only) in which Chapter 1 teachers provided supplementary instruction outside the regular classroom. Reading services were provided mainly through the Homogeneous Laboratory/Classroom model with the remaining reading services almost evenly divided between the Split Laboratory/Classroom and Staff Resource models. Mathematics services were primarily provided through the Homogeneous Laboratory/Classroom model. A total of 836 students received 672 reading services and 638 mathematics services in this component.

Non-Public School Component

The Chapter 1 Non-Public School component operated in nine schools and served 605 students in grades one through eight. Non-public school students were eligible for participation according to the following levels of prior achievement: grades one through six - 20th percentile or below in reading and 49th percentile or below in mathematics; grades seven through ten - stanines one or two in reading and/or mathematics. In addition, to receive Chapter 1 services the students meeting the achievement criteria would have otherwise attended a Chapter 1 public school. Students at the elementary grade levels (grades 1-6) received instruction in both reading and mathematics whereas secondary level students (grades 7 and 8) received instruction in reading and/or mathematics, depending on eligibility.

Chapter 1 instruction at the non-public school sites was provided through the Staff Resource model as described in the Secondary School component; the Extended School Day model in which Chapter 1 teachers and paraprofessionals instructed students in pre or post school hours; and the Pullout model (elementary grades only) as described in the Alternative School component. The Pullout model was most frequently used to provide Chapter 1 services for students in this component.

Center for Neglected or Delinquent Youth Component

Residents of 14 centers for neglected or delinquent youth were selected for Chapter 1 participation on the basis of prior achievement levels at the 30th percentile or below in kindergarten and the first through twenty-fifth percentiles in grades one through twelve in reading and/or mathematics. Chapter 1 services were offered to 667 students either at the residential institution or at the public schools attended by program participants. Chapter 1 funded teachers and paraprofessionals provided tutorial instruction after the completion of the regular school day, (Extended School Day), or during the student's regular reading and/or mathematics class time (Staff Resource). At one center the Homogeneous Laboratory/Classroom model was used to provide mathematics services and the Split Laboratory/Classroom model was used for the provision of Chapter 1 reading services. The Homogeneous and Split Laboratory/Classroom models are described under the Secondary School component.

DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION

Achievement Gains for 1984-85

In order to evaluate the academic benefits which the project was able to produce, an analysis of achievement gains was undertaken. In addition, the effects of specific program characteristics on achievement gains were also examined.

To determine program effectiveness, the norm-referenced model (Model A1) was implemented on a full year (twelve month) evaluation cycle for most of the Chapter 1 participants. Pretesting and posttesting occurred in April, 1984 and April, 1985 respectively, as part of the districtwide administration of the Stanford Achievement Test. For kindergarten students enrolled in the Schoolwide component the norm-referenced model was implemented on a fall to spring evaluation cycle with pretesting occurring in October, 1984 and posttesting in May, 1985 using the California Achievement Test (CAT). Students receiving services at neglected or delinquent centers were also evaluated using the CAT on the basis of the fall to spring cycle. The results of the analysis for the neglected or delinquent centers have not been included in this report due to a limited number of student test scores.

The normal curve equivalent (NCE) score, which was used in the analyses, was mandated at the national level for use in the evaluation and reporting system of 1984-85 Chapter 1 projects. The scale of NCEs extends from one to ninety-nine and has a midpoint of fifty, as does the percentile scale. The NCE scale is more refined than the percentile scale in that NCEs represent equivalent achievement units, whereas percentiles do not reflect equivalent units. This property allows for the legitimate arithmetical manipulation of NCE scores.

An identical NCE obtained on posttest as compared to pretest would reflect the condition that the individual being tested had not changed his/her relative position with respect to the population on which the test had been normed. This condition would be expected unless some unusual educational program intervened to alter the individual's standing with respect to the normative population. Since Chapter 1 is expected to partially compensate for identified educational deficiencies, it was anticipated that participants of the program should demonstrate at least some change in their relative position (with respect to the normative population) from the pretest to the posttest phases of the project. In measurement terms, some gain in their average NCE scores should occur if the project was successful in compensating for the students' original deficiencies.

This evaluation addressed the following questions:

1. Has the district's Chapter 1 program produced achievement gains beyond what would have been expected without the operation of such a program?

2. Did the program have similar impact on reading and mathematics?

3. How did the Staff Resource, Pullout, and Extended School Day instructional models used in the public elementary schools compare with the achievement gains realized in the Full-Day Basic Skills model?

4. How did the achievement gains made at the elementary grade levels compare to gains made at the secondary grade levels?

5. Did the females differ from the males in the achievement gains made in both reading and mathematics?

Monitoring Activities

The Office of Educational Accountability, through its Department of Program Evaluation, has periodically determined the status of district Title I/Chapter 1 operations in the past, and has continued similar reviews of the program in 1984-85. As in prior years, the procedures used to evaluate the program status consisted of two visitations to each of the sites providing services.

The process consisted of structured interviews with administrative personnel and Chapter 1 instructional staff and the examination of such documents as eligibility lists, participant rosters, listings of equipment purchased with Chapter 1 funds, and free and/or reduced price lunch application forms. Besides the administrator, efforts were made to interview at least one Chapter 1-funded teacher, one LEA-funded Chapter 1 teacher, one Chapter 1-funded aide, and one Chapter 1-funded Project Micro Aide at each site where these staff were employed. During each site visit, efforts were made to interview different teachers and aides.

The sites observed were of the following types:

	First Visit	Second Visit
public elementary schools (grades K - 6)	106	106
public junior high/middle schools (grades 5 - 9)	28	28
public senior high schools (grades 9 - 10)	14	14
alternative education schools (grades 6 - 12)	6	6
non-public schools (grades 1 - 10)	9	9
centers for neglected or delinquent youth (grades K - 12)	13	12
Total sites visited	175	174

Of the 177 Chapter 1 sites, 175 were visited at the first visit. Two non-public sites and two centers for the neglected and delinquent were not visited as three did not have programs in operation at the time of the site visits and one had just started its program.

For the second visits, 174 sites were visited. Two non-public schools and three centers for the neglected and delinquent were not visited as they did not have operational programs at the time of the site visits.

The site visitations were designed to gather information pertaining to the following areas of program operation:

1. Student Population - the nature of selection and degree of service to the student population.

2. Site Selection - the compliance with state and federal regulations regarding the maintenance of evidence for school site eligibility, specifically the free and/or reduced price lunch applications and a report of the number of those applications and school membership.

3. Equipment, Supplies, and Materials - the compliance with state and federal regulations regarding the maintenance of records of local funds spent on equipment, supplies, and materials for Chapter 1 participants; the general maintenance of records of Chapter 1 equipment; and the availability and adequacy of the equipment, supplies and materials.

4. Personnel Utilization and Training - the equitable and appropriate use of Chapter 1 personnel and the availability and participation in staff development activities.

5. Instructional Activities - the compliance with contractual agreements and with district implementation guidelines regarding instructional activities and grade reporting.

6. Organization - the compliance with state and federal regulations regarding the availability and completeness of school level planning documents.

7. Project Micro - the compliance with contractual agreements with the state and with district implementation guidelines regarding the computer assisted instruction for Chapter 1 participants.

The first site visit occurred during the period of October 29 to November 14, 1984, which meant that the various sites had been in operation for approximately two months prior to the site visits. The findings from that visit were presented at a conference session to the Office of Federal Projects Administration

personnel, area administrative directors, and program managers approximately three weeks after the site visits were completed. At that session individual site reports were distributed to the appropriate personnel. These reports described each instance of non-compliance or non-implemenation found during the site visits. In addition, a summary of the more frequent problems was presented and discussed.

The same procedure was followed for the second visits which occurred during the period of January 31, 1985 through February 15, 1985 which meant that the various sites had been in operation for approximately five months prior to the site visits. The conference session reporting the findings from these visits took place approximately two weeks following the completion of the site visitations.

Written reports of the data collected for the first and second site visitations were produced (ECIA, Chapter 1 Status Report as of November 14, 1984 and ECIA, Chapter 1 Status Report as of February 15, 1985).

ECIA, Chapter 1 Personnel and Parent Survey

The ECIA, Chapter 1 Personnel and Parent Survey was intended to gather information on the planning and implementation of the 1984-85 Chapter 1 project. The data obtained were used in developing and implementing compensatory educational programs for the 1985-86 school year. Survey questionnaires were mailed to 153 principals, 386 elementary school teachers, 164 secondary school teacher aides/assistants, five project managers, 23 educational specialists, and 181 parents. The questionnaires were developed so as to be appropriate for each group of respondents, although similar dimensions were probed on all of the questionnaires.

The vast majority of the items on the surveys were statements to which the respondent expressed his/her agreement or disagreement on a six point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. After examining the data the six point scale was collapsed across the three agree and three disagree response options to obtain the total percentage or number in agreement or disagreement for each item. The collapsing of the data provides a sharp agree - disagree distinction which is used in the discussion which follows. Also included on the surveys were lists of areas/activities to which the respondent provided information by selecting from specific response options provided, and the provision for the respondent to make written comments and suggestions.

An oral presentation of the preliminary findings was made by the Office of Educational Accountability at a meeting of the Ad Hoc ECIA, Chapter 1 - State Compensatory Education Program Planning Committee on March 28, 1985. In addition, copies of each of the survey forms with the results included were given to the Office of Federal Projects Administration.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Achievement Gains for 1984-85

The impact of the 1984-85 Chapter 1 project on the reading, mathematics, and language achievement of participants was demonstrated by the amount that the average Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) scores changed from pretest to posttest. The information included in this section was obtained from the test scores of 13,072 Chapter 1 reading participants and 12,199 mathematics participants for grades kindergarten through eleven. Additionally, language test results for public elementary school participants in grades 4, 5, and 6 are included. This population represents those promoted pupils for whom both pretest and posttest scores were available. Summary data are generally presented separately for reading, mathematics, and language achievement by grade level.

For the 1984-85 Chapter 1 project, test scores from the April, 1984 districtwide administration of the Stanford Achievement Test were used to determine student eligibility. This was the first year in which student eligibility was based on test scores from the previous Spring test administration. In addition, test scores from the same administration of the Stanford were used as the pretest for the Chapter 1 evaluation. This was also the first year in which Total Reading scores (grades 1-6) and Total Mathematics scores (grades 1-10) were used in the evaluation of Chapter 1. Due to these changes, comparisons to previous years achievement test results are not recommended.

Public elementary schools. Tables 2 through 8 present the achievement results for the three public elementary school components (Schoolwide, Elementary, Chapter 1/SCE). A review of the tables reveals that positive average NCE gains were achieved in reading and mathematics for all three components and in language for the Chapter 1/SCE component. The average reading and mathematics gains reported for the Schoolwide component must be viewed with caution. Included in the average weighted totals are the gains for the kindergarten participants which are substantially higher than the gains for grades one through six and distort the overall results. For each component, the overall average gain in mathematics exceeds the overall average gain in reading and language.

The Elementary component Staff Resource model is the only contingency model with a sufficient number of students to allow a reasonable comparison of achievement gains to be made with the Full-Day Basic Skills model. In reading, participants in the Staff Resource model achieved a slightly higher overall NCE gain (2.9 NCEs) than the Full-Day model participants (1.6 NCEs). In mathematics, the participants in the Full-Day model achieved a higher overall NCE gain (2.1 NCEs) than the participants in the Staff Resource model (0.2 NCEs).

Table 2

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Schoolwide Component
Achievement Test Results by Subject
Average NCE Gains

Grade Level	Total Reading		Total Mathematics		Language	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gai
K	265	20.9	265	29.1	--	-
1	32	-3.7	32	2.8	--	-
2	56	-6.4	54	-2.0	--	-
3	79	4.1	78	2.7	--	-
4	170	3.5	168	-1.6	166	-4.
5	187	-1.0	184	0.9	183	-0.
6	160	-1.1	159	1.5	155	0.
Average Weighted Totals	949	4.7	940	8.6	504	-1.

Table 3

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Elementary Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

	Full Day		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Pullout		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	1052	3.1	44	12.3	2	16.1	3	-10.2	1101	3.5
2	846	-1.6	63	-0.1	--	--	4	2.1	913	-1.5
3	1199	3.9	47	0.8	--	--	6	4.8	1252	3.8
4	1270	-0.1	58	-0.7	7	-4.1	5	-1.9	1340	-0.2
5	1420	0.9	48	-1.6	--	--	3	6.8	1471	0.8
6	1170	3.1	62	3.0	--	--	1	5.9	1233	3.1
Average Weighted Totals	6957	1.6	322	2.0	9	0.4	22	1.1	7310	1.6

Table 4

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Elementary Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

	Full Day		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Pullout		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	1060	3.1	44	-2.3	2	-18.9	4	-9.9	1110	2.8
2	849	1.5	63	2.3	--	--	5	10.5	917	1.6
3	1244	1.8	47	-2.1	--	--	6	5.1	1297	1.7
4	1241	-0.1	53	-1.2	7	-11.1	5	-5.1	1306	-0.1
5	1411	4.2	46	3.8	--	--	3	-1.7	1460	4.2
6	1161	1.7	60	0.2	--	--	1	7.2	1222	1.6
Average Weighted Totals	6966	2.1	313	0.2	9	-12.8	24	0.8	7312	2.0

Table 5

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Elementary Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Language - Average NCE Gains

	Full Day		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Pullout		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
4	1262	-2.5	59	-3.4	7	-6.2	4	2.3	1332	-2.5
5	1421	1.3	46	0.0	--	--	2	-4.1	1469	1.3
6	1167	1.1	60	2.2	--	--	1	6.3	1228	1.2
Average Weighted Totals	3850	0.0	165	0.4	7	-6.2	7	1.0	4029	0.0

Table 6

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Chapter 1/SCE Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

Grade Level	Full Day		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Pullout		Total	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	37	-1.9	3	6.4	--	--	--	--	40	-1.3
2	53	-6.6	4	-13.2	2	-1.5	--	--	59	-6.9
3	93	3.2	12	4.1	--	--	--	--	105	3.3
4	90	1.6	8	-0.5	--	--	3	11.4	101	1.7
5	126	0.1	8	1.1	--	--	1	6.8	135	0.2
6	122	2.9	23	3.4	--	--	6	6.6	151	3.1
Average Weighted Totals	521	0.7	58	1.7	2	-1.5	10	8.1	591	0.9

Table 7

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Chapter 1/SCE Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

Grade Level	Full Day		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Pullout		Total	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	39	4.8	3	9.8	--	--	--	--	42	5.2
2	51	-0.1	4	-6.6	2	-9.6	--	--	57	-0.9
3	93	-0.4	12	-2.5	--	--	--	--	105	-0.6
4	92	1.9	7	7.4	--	--	3	4.4	102	2.4
5	126	3.5	8	-1.3	--	--	1	0.6	135	3.2
6	124	4.5	23	5.5	--	--	6	0.8	153	4.5
Average Weighted Totals	525	2.5	57	2.5	2	-9.6	10	1.9	594	2.5

Table 8

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Chapter 1/SCE Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Language - Average NCE Gains

Grade Level	Full Day		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Pullout		Total	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
4	94	0.0	5	6.8	--	--	3	16.1	102	0.8
5	126	4.0	8	1.7	--	--	1	-20.2	135	3.7
6	122	3.5	23	5.8	--	--	5	-2.7	150	3.6
Average Weighted Totals	342	2.7	36	5.0	--	--	9	1.6	387	2.9

Public secondary schools. Secondary School component reading and mathematics achievement test results are presented in Tables 9 and 10, respectively. An inspection of these tables reveals that positive overall average gains were recorded in both subjects.

In the Secondary School component, the Reading Comprehension subtest was used for both the selection and evaluation of students in grades seven through ten. This, plus the very low participant selection criteria of the first and second stanines, may have increased the possibility that the positive gains seen in the Secondary School component may not be due entirely to the effect of the Chapter 1 program on achievement, but to the effect of regression. The tendency for gain scores to reflect regression is increased when the same test is used for selection and evaluation because repeated measurements of a phenomenon using the same instrument leads to a score closer to the mean. This tendency is also increased when inclusion is based on a narrow range of extreme scores as in the Secondary School component. Because these students were selected with scores very far from the mean, they would, therefore, have a high probability of moving closer to the mean on subsequent testing. A more lenghtly explanation of regression can be found in Appendix D.

A regression correction procedure prescribed by the Florida Department of Education has been applied to the Secondary results for grades seven through eleven in reading and grade 11 in mathematics. However, this correction may not have accounted for all the regression as it is not based on test results from Dade County but from national data supplied by the test publisher. The correction factor applied to the gain scores may have underestimated the amount of regression in the scores. Thus, although the large gains for the Secondary School component are welcomed, they must be viewed cautiously.

Public alternative schools. Alternative School component reading and mathematics achievement test results are presented in Tables 11 and 12, respectively. A slight positive overall NCE gain is reported for reading while a negative result is reported for mathematics.

Non-public schools. Non-Public School component achievement test results for reading and mathematics are displayed in Tables 13 and 14. Overall average positive NCE gains were achieved in both reading and mathematics. Positive NCE gains were achieved at all grade levels in both reading and mathematics except at the fourth grade in reading and mathematics and at the eighth grade in mathematics.

Public schools. Tables 15, 16, and 17 report the district public schools achievement test results for males and females in reading, mathematics, and language. Positive overall NCE gains were achieved in both reading and mathematics. With the exception of the second and fourth grades, positive gains were achieved in reading at all grade levels. Positive NCE gains in mathematics were achieved at all grade levels except for a slight

Table 9

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Secondary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

	Homogeneous Class/Lab		Split Class/Lab		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
5	56	3.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	56	3.6
6	163	3.1	—	—	31	3.1	—	—	194	3.1
7	1030	8.5	55	9.4	202	10.1	—	—	1287	8.8
8	972	9.1	64	10.4	199	9.7	—	—	1235	9.3
9	497	10.1	93	4.7	215	10.5	—	—	805	9.6
10	309	9.3	118	8.6	106	10.4	—	—	533	9.4
11	2	11.0	—	—	3	2.7	—	—	5	6.0
Average Weighted Totals	3029	8.7	330	8.0	756	9.8	—	—	4115	8.8

Table 10

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Secondary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

Grade Level	Homogeneous Class/Lab		Split Class/Lab		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Total	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
5	24	5.9			—	—	—	—	24	5.9
6	97	-3.2			8	3.7	—	—	105	-2.7
7	683	5.6	43	3.9	143	6.7	—	—	869	5.7
8	501	1.9	40	3.1	100	1.9	—	—	641	2.0
9	671	5.4	1	-3.5	256	5.9	—	—	928	5.5
10	543	6.9	—	—	157	7.0	—	—	700	6.9
11	6	0.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	0.8
Average Weighted Totals	2525	4.7	84	3.4	664	5.7	—	—	3273	4.9

Table 11

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Alternative School Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

	Homogeneous Class/Lab		Split Class/Lab		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Pullout		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
6	2	-11.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	-11.3
7	9	0.9	—	—	2	-2.0	—	—	—	—	11	0.4
8	41	-0.8	—	—	2	6.0	—	—	—	—	43	-0.5
9	1	10.5	9	3.2	5	-0.9	—	—	—	—	15	2.3
10	—	—	8	6.6	8	3.1	—	—	—	—	16	4.9
11	—	—	5	-4.6	10	1.2	—	—	—	—	15	-0.7
Average Weighted Totals	53	-0.7	22	2.7	27	1.5	—	—	—	—	102	0.6

Table 12

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Alternative School Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

Grade Level	Homogeneous Class/Lab		Split Class/Lab		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Pullout		Total	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
6	2	-15.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	-15.2
7	6	11.9	—	—	1	0.0	—	—	—	—	7	10.2
8	28	-5.3	—	—	1	-4.6	—	—	—	—	29	-5.3
9	10	-2.4	—	—	6	1.2	—	—	—	—	16	-1.1
10	4	0.9	—	—	7	0.3	—	—	—	—	11	0.5
11	4	7.5	—	—	7	1.5	—	—	—	—	11	3.7
Average Weighted Totals	54	-1.8	—	—	22	0.7	—	—	—	—	76	-1.1

Table 13

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Non-Public School Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

Grade Level	Homogeneous Class/Lab		Split Class/Lab		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Pullout		Total	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	—	—	—	—	5	-9.2	—	—	34	6.7	39	4.7
2	—	—	—	—	1	-4.8	—	—	25	3.6	26	3.3
3	—	—	—	—	5	7.3	2	2.8	41	1.6	48	2.2
4	—	—	—	—	4	0.7	2	10.5	23	-3.5	29	-2.0
5	—	—	—	—	12	6.2	1	-6.4	41	0.6	54	1.7
6	—	—	—	—	9	7.1	4	6.1	42	7.8	55	7.6
7	—	—	—	—	20	9.6	2	17.9	N/A	N/A	22	10.4
8	—	—	—	—	31	10.3	1	27.3	N/A	N/A	32	10.8
Average Weighted Totals	—	—	—	—	87	7.3	12	9.0	206	3.2	305	4.6

Table 14

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Non-Public School Component
Achievement Test Results by Model
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

Grade Level	Homogeneous Class/Lab		Split Class/Lab		Staff Resource		Extended School Day		Pullout		Total	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	—	—	—	—	5	0.7	—	—	34	3.6	39	3.2
2	—	—	—	—	1	-14.8	—	—	25	0.8	26	0.2
3	—	—	—	—	5	-0.7	2	-1.0	39	4.2	46	3.4
4	—	—	—	—	4	-14.1	2	8.0	23	-7.3	29	-7.2
5	—	—	—	—	12	2.4	1	-6.2	41	0.0	54	0.4
6	—	—	—	—	9	3.3	4	8.2	42	2.8	55	3.3
7	—	—	—	—	19	8.6	2	11.5	—	—	21	8.9
8	—	—	—	—	20	-2.6	2	11.0	—	—	22	-1.4
Average Weighted Totals	—	—	—	—	75	1.3	13	6.6	204	1.3	292	1.5

Table 15

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
District Public Schools
Achievement Test Results by Gender
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

	Males		Females		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
K	—	—	—	—	265	20.9
1	646	3.7	527	2.6	1173	3.2
2	601	-2.3	427	-1.6	1028	-2.1
3	820	2.7	618	5.0	1438	3.7
4	911	-1.0	700	0.4	1611	-0.4
5	946	0.5	904	0.9	1850	0.7
6	919	2.9	821	2.4	1740	2.6
Average Weighted Totals (K-6)	4843	1.1	3997	1.7	9105	1.9
7	753	8.6	545	8.7	1298	8.7
8	682	8.4	596	9.5	1278	8.9
9	449	9.6	371	9.2	820	9.4
10	288	9.2	263	9.5	551	9.3
11	10	2.7	10	-0.9	20	0.9
Average Weighted Totals (7-11)	2182	8.8	1735	9.1	3967	9.0
Average Weighted Totals (K-11)	7025	3.5	5782	4.0	13072	4.1

Table 16

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
District Public Schools
Achievement Test Results by Gender
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

	Males		Females		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
K	—	—	—	—	265	29.1
1	650	2.4	534	3.4	1184	2.8
2	604	0.8	424	1.9	1028	1.2
3	851	1.3	631	1.9	1482	3.7
4	895	-0.5	681	0.1	1576	-0.2
5	922	3.8	882	4.0	1804	3.9
6	851	1.8	790	1.4	1641	1.6
Average Weighted Totals (K-6)	4773	1.6	3942	2.2	8980	3.0
7	437	6.6	440	5.0	877	5.8
8	337	1.1	333	2.1	670	1.6
9	448	5.7	496	5.2	944	5.4
10	324	7.3	387	6.4	711	6.8
11	10	2.9	7	2.2	17	2.6
Average Weighted Totals (7-11)	1556	5.3	1663	4.8	3219	5.0
Average Weighted Totals (K-11)	6329	2.5	5605	2.9	12199	3.5

Table 17

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
District Public Schools
Achievement Test Results by Gender
Language - Average NCE Gains

	Males		Females		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
4	908	-3.0	692	-1.8	1600	-2.5
5	943	1.5	900	0.7	1843	1.1
6	913	1.3	815	0.9	1728	1.1
Average Weighted Totals (4-6)	2764	0.0	2407	0.0	5171	0.0

negative result reported for the fourth grade. Achievement results for language (grades 4-6) reveal an overall NCE gain of zero although positive gains were achieved at grades five and six.

The overall negative results for second and fourth grade reading may be reflective of the pattern of districtwide Stanford median percentile scores for 1984 and 1985. The districtwide results contain relatively large declines for two of the three subtests that comprise the Total Reading score for the second grade and one of the two subtests that comprise the Total Reading score for the fourth grade. In addition, a similar pattern of negative results was reported for several other districts in the state that use the Stanford for Chapter 1 evaluation.

In examining Tables 15, 16, and 17 for the results by gender it was observed that both the overall gains for grades one through eleven and the overall gains for grades one through six were higher for females in both reading and mathematics. The reported overall gain for grades seven through eleven in mathematics was greater for males. Further examination of the results for grades one through eleven reveals that females had higher gain scores at the majority of the grade levels in both reading and mathematics. The overall achievement gain reported for language (grades 4-6) was zero for both the females and males although the males exhibited a higher NCE gain at grades five and six.

Tables 15 and 16 present data allowing for the comparison of the elementary grade level (K-6) and the secondary grade level (7-11) achievement test results. An examination of these tables reveals that the gain exhibited at the secondary grade level is greater than the gain at the elementary grade level in both reading and mathematics. This is especially evident for the reading results which show a 7.1 NCE average weighted gain difference between the elementary grades and the secondary grades. The mathematics results, although in the same direction, do not show as great a difference. As discussed earlier, the secondary level gains must be interpreted cautiously due to the selection procedures which may have increased the regression effect on these gain scores.

Administrative areas. Tables 18 through 32 report achievement test results for each component by administrative area (North, North Central 1, North Central 2, South Central, South). The data are presented by grade level for reading, mathematics, and language.

Individual schools. Individual school achievement test results for all Chapter 1 public and non-public schools are presented in Appendix E.

Table 18

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Schoolwide Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

Grade Level	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
K	—	—	—	—	74	13.6	84	35.9	107	14.2	265	20.9
1	—	—	—	—	12	-5.9	—	—	20	-2.5	32	-3.8
2	—	—	—	—	18	-8.2	—	—	38	-5.4	56	-6.3
3	—	—	—	—	34	8.0	—	—	45	1.1	79	4.0
4	—	—	—	—	51	-2.7	77	-3.5	42	-4.5	170	-3.5
5	—	—	—	—	65	0.7	71	-0.1	51	-4.4	187	-1.0
6	—	—	—	—	78	1.1	82	-3.1	—	—	160	-1.1
Average Weighted Totals	—	—	—	—	332	3.2	314	7.9	303	3.0	949	4.7

Table 19

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Schoolwide Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
K	—	—	—	—	74	29.5	84	42.9	107	18.1	265	29.1
1	—	—	—	—	12	12.9	—	—	20	-3.2	32	2.8
2	—	—	—	—	17	-5.7	—	—	37	-0.3	54	-1.6
3	—	—	—	—	35	7.9	—	—	43	-1.6	78	2.7
4	—	—	—	—	51	-2.1	76	-3.2	41	1.8	168	-1.6
5	—	—	—	—	64	2.7	69	2.4	51	-3.1	184	1.0
6	—	—	—	—	78	3.3	81	-0.1	—	—	159	1.6
Average Weighted Totals	—	—	—	—	331	8.6	310	11.3	299	5.7	940	8.6

Table 20

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Schoolwide Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Language - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
4	—	—	—	—	49	-10.4	75	-0.9	42	-2.0	166	-4.0
5	—	—	—	—	64	-1.9	69	2.4	50	-2.8	183	-0.5
6	—	—	—	—	78	-0.4	77	1.1	—	—	155	0.3
Average Weighted Totals	—	—	—	—	191	-3.5	221	0.8	92	-2.4	504	-1.4

Table 21

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Elementary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	216	5.1	348	1.7	295	6.7	77	3.8	165	-0.4	1101	3.5
2	120	-1.9	329	-1.1	269	-1.6	86	0.1	109	-3.0	913	-1.5
3	213	2.8	371	3.8	338	4.6	172	4.8	158	2.0	1252	3.8
4	249	-1.0	423	1.0	351	-1.9	136	3.8	181	-1.1	1340	-0.1
5	282	1.1	425	1.3	445	0.4	98	2.3	221	0.0	1471	0.9
6	322	2.4	341	3.6	388	2.6	106	3.7	76	5.3	1233	3.1
Average Weighted Totals	1402	1.6	2237	1.7	2086	1.7	675	3.3	910	0.1	7310	1.7

Table 22

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Elementary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	217	7.6	352	1.2	297	2.2	80	5.0	164	-0.1	1110	2.8
2	124	-0.6	330	2.6	267	1.3	83	2.5	113	1.3	917	1.6
3	212	-0.1	431	1.7	329	4.3	170	1.5	155	-1.6	1297	1.6
4	244	-1.0	421	0.7	335	-1.5	131	2.5	175	-1.0	1306	-0.2
5	282	1.9	424	6.1	437	4.6	95	1.2	222	4.3	1460	4.2
6	321	2.0	338	2.0	383	0.6	106	0.2	74	6.1	1222	1.7
Average Weighted Totals	1400	1.8	2296	2.4	2048	2.0	665	2.0	903	1.2	7312	2.0

Table 23

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Elementary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Language - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
4	249	-2.4	419	-0.7	347	-4.6	137	-0.5	180	-4.1	1332	-2.5
5	287	1.6	418	2.3	445	0.7	96	2.8	223	-1.0	1469	1.2
6	316	2.2	340	-0.1	391	1.0	105	0.7	76	3.7	1228	1.1
Average Weighted Totals	852	0.7	1177	0.5	1183	-0.8	338	0.8	479	-1.4	4029	0.0

Table 24

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Chapter 1/SCE Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	16	-1.4	5	3.6	1	-13.6	14	-0.9	4	-6.0	40	-1.4
2	18	-5.8	3	-13.5	4	6.2	14	-7.6	20	-9.1	59	-6.9
3	35	0.8	11	1.3	15	3.7	20	5.4	24	5.8	105	3.3
4	23	3.0	9	0.3	15	-3.8	27	3.5	27	2.3	101	1.7
5	50	-0.3	26	-2.2	12	-3.1	31	4.0	17	0.0	136	0.1
6	60	3.8	9	3.6	24	-1.6	34	2.3	24	7.1	151	3.1
Average Weighted Totals	202	0.9	63	-0.5	71	-0.9	140	2.0	116	1.4	592	0.9

Table 25

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Chapter 1/SCE Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	18	4.0	5	-4.5	1	2.2	14	11.4	4	1.4	42	5.2
2	16	-4.4	3	-2.0	4	18.6	14	-2.6	20	-0.6	57	-0.9
3	35	0.9	11	0.9	15	0.6	19	-1.3	25	-3.8	105	-0.7
4	23	6.7	9	-9.4	15	-0.4	28	3.5	27	2.8	102	2.3
5	50	0.9	25	0.9	12	7.5	31	7.6	18	1.7	136	3.1
6	59	4.7	9	3.5	24	2.2	36	4.5	25	6.5	153	4.5
Average Weighted Totals	201	2.5	62	-0.8	71	3.1	142	4.2	119	1.4	595	2.4

Table 26

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Chapter 1/SCE Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Language - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
4	24	-0.1	9	2.3	15	-3.2	25	-0.4	29	4.3	102	0.8
5	50	4.0	25	-0.3	12	5.7	31	4.9	18	3.5	136	3.5
6	58	6.0	9	5.2	24	0.4	36	2.1	23	2.8	150	3.6
Average Weighted Totals	132	4.1	43	1.4	51	0.6	92	2.4	70	3.6	388	2.8

Table 27

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Secondary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
5	—	—	65	2.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	65	2.3
6	—	—	105	-1.2	—	—	36	2.1	115	2.9	256	1.1
7	275	11.1	333	8.2	290	7.8	273	9.4	117	5.7	1288	8.8
8	323	11.7	325	7.1	331	10.4	178	8.4	80	5.5	1237	9.3
9	212	9.0	210	7.4	208	11.2	112	11.6	65	9.1	807	9.5
10	127	10.5	148	8.7	138	9.6	71	9.2	53	7.8	537	9.3
11	4	6.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	5.6	5	6.0
Average Weighted Totals	941	10.7	1186	6.7	967	9.7	670	9.1	431	5.7	4195	8.6

Table 28

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Secondary School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	Gain
5	—	—	66	-0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	66	-0.2
6	—	—	103	-4.0	—	—	36	-2.0	111	-1.9	250	-2.8
7	362	1.6	443	3.8	381	2.7	324	1.3	138	1.2	1648	2.4
8	389	0.2	402	1.2	366	0.4	223	-0.3	96	-0.6	1476	0.4
9	366	4.4	320	4.3	332	6.1	169	6.7	110	1.0	1297	4.8
10	235	6.2	238	5.3	224	5.9	108	6.1	126	5.5	931	5.8
11	2	-2.2	2	5.4	1	-14.4	—	—	1	12.7	6	0.8
Average Weighted Totals	1354	2.7	1574	2.8	1304	3.5	860	2.4	582	1.2	5674	2.7

Table 29

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Alternative School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	Gain
6	—	—	1	-9.4	—	—	2	-14.8	—	—	3	-13.0
7	—	—	5	0.0	—	—	5	3.8	1	-14.0	11	0.5
8	—	—	37	-1.5	—	—	6	5.7	—	—	43	-0.5
9	—	—	10	4.0	—	—	—	—	5	-0.9	15	2.4
10	—	—	11	8.5	—	—	—	—	6	2.0	17	6.2
11	—	—	12	-0.2	—	—	—	—	5	0.1	17	-0.1
Average Weighted Totals	—	—	76	0.9	—	—	13	1.8	17	-0.4	106	0.8

Table 30

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Alternative School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
6	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	-15.2	—	—	2	-15.2
7	—	—	4	11.9	—	—	4	3.8	—	—	8	7.9
8	—	—	29	-7.1	—	—	8	-3.0	—	—	37	-6.2
9	—	—	14	-4.8	—	—	—	—	7	1.5	21	-2.7
10	—	—	8	-3.3	—	—	—	—	7	-2.2	15	-2.8
11	—	—	8	4.9	—	—	—	—	3	0.3	11	3.6
Average Weighted Totals	—	—	63	-3.4	—	—	14	-2.8	17	-0.2	94	-2.7

Table 31

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Non-Public School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Reading - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gai
1	6	-0.7	4	32.8	11	4.1	12	4.9	6	-8.3	39	4.
2	3	-7.2	6	-1.7	6	2.6	8	3.3	3	25.6	26	3.
3	10	0.1	8	1.5	9	1.5	17	3.0	4	7.2	48	2.
4	5	8.1	3	7.9	11	-7.7	7	-4.6	3	-1.4	29	-2.
5	10	3.6	12	1.4	22	-1.9	9	7.5	1	11.9	54	1.
6	10	6.3	9	16.5	17	3.3	16	9.0	3	1.3	55	7.
7	4	11.1	6	4.4	8	2.1	7	18.4	—	—	25	8.
8	3	17.1	12	8.5	5	12.7	10	13.3	2	2.7	32	11.
Average Weighted Totals	51	4.1	60	7.5	89	0.9	86	6.7	22	3.3	308	4.

Table 32

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Non-Public School Component
Achievement Test Results by Administrative Area
Total Mathematics - Average NCE Gains

	North		North Central 1		North Central 2		South Central		South		Total	
Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	6	4.3	4	6.3	11	0.9	12	5.6	6	-0.4	39	3.2
2	3	0.9	6	4.4	6	-0.2	8	-4.9	3	5.5	26	0.2
3	10	5.9	8	-3.6	9	0.5	15	4.8	4	12.2	46	3.4
4	5	10.0	3	-10.0	11	-11.2	7	-10.8	3	-10.8	29	-7.3
5	10	3.6	12	7.3	22	-4.1	9	-1.5	1	3.5	54	0.4
6	10	4.7	9	10.1	17	-3.5	16	7.6	3	-5.0	55	3.4
7	6	5.6	11	6.9	10	6.5	--	--	2	5.2	29	6.4
8	5	3.5	18	-6.2	6	3.8	5	-5.5	2	2.5	36	-2.6
Average Weighted Totals	55	4.9	71	1.9	92	-1.9	72	1.5	24	1.4	314	1.2

Monitoring Activities

Problems identified - first site visit. These findings were presented in conference with Office of Federal Projects Administration personnel, area administrative directors, and program managers on December 5, 1984.

Overall, the program was found to be functioning quite smoothly considering the size of the program, the changes that were made last year in the elementary schools and this year in the secondary schools. The following problems were identified by their relatively more frequent occurence at sites across the district.

Chapter 1 personnel at 23 of 175 sites indicated in interviews that they had not participated in inservice activities. Personnel at 16 sites expressed a need for inservice regarding the specific software used in Project Micro. Another problem identified was the insufficient allocation of LEA teachers at nine elementary schools.

Problems were noted regarding the appropriate pupil-staff ratios at 27 of the 175 sites districtwide. At 15 of the elementary schools visited there were one or more Full-Day Basic Skills classes which exceeded the 16:1 ratio. In addition, at 13 elementary sites the minimum duration of 35 minutes of aide time per pupil in the contingency models was not provided. At 12 of the 42 secondary sites the maximum ratio of 125 Chapter 1 services per five hours of aide time was exceeded. Thirteen sites across the district were not serving all eligible Chapter 1 students. This included nine elementary, two secondary, and two non-public schools.

Eighteen sites were either unable to locate their 1982-83 lunch forms or their lunch forms were missing required signatures or dates. The "Census of Free and/or Reduced Price Lunch Applications and School Membership" form was not available at seven elementary and six secondary schools. In thirty of the sites across the district, the Chapter 1 equipment list was lacking one of the required categories.

Interviews with Chapter 1 personnel at the 114 public elementary and non-public school sites indicated that at 15 sites the Project Micro aide, rather than the teacher, was prescribing the computer software.

Problems identified - second site visit. These findings were presented in conference with Office of Federal Projects Administration personnel, area administrative directors, and program managers on March 1, 1985. The following problems were identified at sites across the district.

A careful inspection of the Chapter 1 rosters of participants revealed 30 out of 174 sites across the district at which appropriate scores were not entered, rosters were not updated, or

students whose scores were above the criteria for Chapter 1 participation were receiving services. At 10 sites, not all students elegible for Chapter 1 participation were receiving services.

Eleven out of 174 sites visited reported that they had Chapter 1 equipment which was not in satisfactory working order.

Spot checks of payroll records and substitute cards revealed nine sites with at least one instance of an absence of an LEA-funded Chapter 1 teacher without a corresponding substitute record and seven sites with at least one instance of an absence of a Chapter 1-funded teacher without a corresponding substitute record. At 15 sites, at least one of the Chapter 1 personnel reported that he/she had not participated in any staff development/inservice activities and at 30 sites at least one of the Chapter 1 personnel interviewed indicated that adequate inservice was not provided.

ECIA, Chapter 1 Personnel and Parent Survey

Nine hundred and twelve survey forms were distributed with a total of 544 (60%) completed and returned. As is shown in Table 33, the return rate for completed questionnaires ranged from a high of 73 percent for administrators to a low of 27 percent for parents.

Table 33

ECIA, Chapter 1 Personnel and Parent Survey
Number of Survey Forms Distributed and Returned

Form	Distributed	Returned
Administrator	153	111 (73%)
Elementary Teacher	386	279 (72%)
Secondary Aide	164	92 (56%)
Project Manager	5	3 (60%)
Area Educational Specialist	23	11 (48%)
Parent	181	48 (27%)
Overall	912	544 (60%)

For each of the surveys, results for the overall respondent group were obtained. Where appropriate, results for subgroups within the overall respondent group were obtained as well. The discussion of the survey results which follows is based almost exclusively on the overall findings for each of the six respondent groups with specific noteworthy subgroup findings presented where appropriate. A copy of each of the survey forms with the results included for each of the overall populations and subgroups can be found in Appendix F.

Administrator survey. A review of the responses to the administrator survey reveals that, in general, little difficulty was experienced in planning and implementing the Chapter 1 program. All statements regarding the process used to plan the Chapter 1 program and the adequacy and clarity of information provided to facilitate program planning received favorable ratings by at least 75 percent of the respondents. Especially favorable rates of agreement were obtained on statements indicating that from the information provided, the administrators clearly understood the policies regarding the handling of Chapter 1 materials (95%), and that the information concerning the various Chapter 1 classroom models was clear and helped facilitate program planning (93%). From a list of five areas, administrators indicated that they experienced difficulty in the following: "obtaining parental involvement in the planning of the program" (60%); "ascertaining which students were eligible for Chapter 1 services" (27%); and "developing a plan to provide the appropriate reading and math services to all eligible students" (26%).

On the questionnaire administrators were also asked to describe problems experienced in developing their program. A total of 26 different problem areas were identified in developing their Chapter 1 program. Twenty one of these areas only had one or two respondents indicating that it was a problem area. The most frequently mentioned problem area (N = 13) was the late arrival of test scores used to determine student eligibility. A relatively high number of administrators also reported problems as a result of continued changes in the student eligibility criteria (N = 5), and in scheduling elementary school resource students for 35 minutes (N = 4).

When asked to state suggestions that could potentially improve the Chapter 1 planning process, a total of 13 different suggestions were provided. Of these 13 suggestions, ten had only one or two respondents making that suggestion. The most frequent suggestions were to provide student test scores prior to planning for the upcoming school year (N = 8), providing for more input from principals (N = 5), and going back to the 15:1 student-teacher ratio in the secondary schools.

Most statements regarding the implementation of the Chapter 1 program were favorably rated by the administrators. The highest rates of agreement were provided for statements which indicate that the Chapter 1 program appears to positively influence its participants' writing skills (92%), and achievement in reading (94%) and math (94%). A relatively high rate of agreement was also made in response to a statement indicating that the program documents regarding the utilization of Chapter 1 personnel were clear and concise (93%). The lowest rate of agreement was given by elementary school administrators to a statement indicating that two teachers working in the same classroom with each teacher serving 16 students works well (43%). Relatively low agreement rates were also provided to a statement indicating that few problems were experienced in recruiting suitable teachers and aides (67%), and a statement indicating that few difficulties

were encountered in devising instructional schedules for Chapter 1 teachers and aides (70%).

Administrators were asked to list areas in which the Chapter 1 staff would benefit from more inservice training. A total of 17 different areas were listed with ten of the seventeen areas identified by only one or two respondents. The most frequently identified area was language experience/oral language development (N = 14). Other areas of inservice training that were listed relatively frequently were computer education (N = 7), affective education (N = 5), and classroom management (N = 5).

Elementary teacher survey. A review of the findings reveals generally positive results. An especially positive response was provided to a statement indicating that the 16:1 pupil-teacher ratio is more effective than the typical ratio (99% agreement). Highly favorable responses were also obtained regarding the effectiveness of the Full-Day Basic Skills program as a method for improving students' abilities in math (95% agreement), reading (96% agreement), language development (89% agreement), and writing (95% agreement). The lowest percentage of agreement was provided to a statement indicating that having two teachers, with 16 students each, in a single regular-sized classroom is not harmful to instruction (36%). Other statements receiving relatively low ratings were: "the amount and variety of instructional materials provided to Chapter 1 personnel are sufficient" (62% agreement), and "the Chapter 1 program's emphasis on basic skills causes too many limitations and restrictions on my teaching" (33% agreement).

Overall 65 percent of the teachers indicated that their classroom was suitable for teaching their students. Of the teachers working in a regular-sized classroom with two teachers, each with approximately 16 students, 46 percent reported that their classroom was suitable. Overall, 75 percent of the teachers indicated that they preferred to remain in the Chapter 1 program during the next school year even if it was necessary to share a classroom.

Elementary teachers who disagreed with a statement indicating that their classroom was suitable for teaching their students were asked to list the problems that they encountered as a result of their classroom situation. The responses provided were grouped into nine different areas. Four of the nine areas only had one or two persons providing that response and the remaining five areas were related to space and noise problems. The area indicated as a problem by the greatest mumber of teachers (N = 68) was that of noise. Other frequently listed problems encountered as a result of classroom situations include not enough space (N = 23), restricted activities (N = 20), not sufficient space to have reading/learning centers (N = 16), and being crowded (N = 12).

In nine areas teachers were asked to select from specific response options regarding their receipt of and/or need for

inservice training and support materials. The areas of "language experience approach", "Total Math Program", "Reading Systems/Very Plain", and "oral language development" had the highest percentage of respondents indicating that they had received inservice training and support materials. The greatest need for inservice training was in the areas of "test-taking strategies" (20%), and "project micro" (23%). The greatest need for support materials was indicated for the areas of "test taking strategies" (34%), "regular composition activities" (30%), and "the use of manipulatives" (49%). In addition to the nine areas listed, teachers were asked to list any other areas in which they would like inservice training. A total of ten different inservice areas were identified. The most frequently indicated areas were computer training (N = 11), behavior and classroom management strategies (N = 6), the language experience approach (N = 5), and motivating the slow learner (N = 3).

Teachers were also asked to select from a list of seven activities, those activities that they think benefited from the support provided by Chapter 1 resources. The activities identified most frequently as benefiting from the support provided include "the teaching of oral language development" (77%), "the use of the language experience approach" (76%), and "the teaching of reading" (63%). Activities identified least frequently as benefiting from support provided were "offering incentives to students" (37%), and "the development of individualized educational plans" (41%).

Secondary aide survey. Results of the secondary aide survey are generally positive. Especially high rates of agreement (99%) were provided for statements indicating that the directions and support received from teachers is sufficient and that the articulation procedures between the teachers and Chapter 1 paraprofessionals are effective. The need for more inservice training was indicated by 59 percent of the respondents with a relatively low percentage of respondents (76%) reporting that inservice is provided at convenient times.

In response to a request to indicate areas in which they feel a need for more training, the most frequent response (N = 20) was for additional computer and software training. Other training needs indicated were upgrading skills in English (N = 4), classroom management techniques (N = 2), and mathematics (N = 1).

Project manager survey. Program favorable responses were provided for almost all statements. For most program models high rates of agreement were obtained for a statement indicating that little or no difficulty was encountered in implementing that model. Respondents disagreed with a statement indicating that little or no difficulty was encountered in the implementation of the staff resource model and with the same statement for the extended school day model.

When asked to list problems encountered while supporting the Chapter 1 program, the project managers indicated that they

experienced difficulty scheduling aide time at the required 35 minutes per student, and that principals react negatively when the required number of locally funded Chapter 1 teachers is greater than the number of Chapter 1 funded teachers.

When asked to list problems encountered in planning and coordinating inservice activities, the following was provided: no days set aside for planning and conducting inservice activities; aides are part-time and often do not attend inservice because they do not get paid overtime; teachers are tired when inservice is offered formally and must be given one-to-one during the day; and getting teachers together for group inservice sessions.

Recommendations provided for improving Chapter 1 included revamping the organizational structure of the area offices to more effectively utilize personnel; to have full-day basic skills classes in a few schools where resources and efforts could be concentrated; changing the contingency model to 30 or 50 minutes per child; identifying days for county and/or area inservice activities; and developing a monitoring check off form for educational specialists and project managers.

Area educational specialist survey. Because of the small number of respondents (N = 11), the results of the educational specialist survey were reported in the number rather than percentage of respondents. Program favorable responses were provided for almost all statements. Especially favorable responses (11 out of 11 in agreement) were provided to statements indicating that the program staff they work with participate in appropriate inservice activities; that cooperation and positive interactions appear to be characteristic of the relationships among the teaching staff; that they feel positive about the program's strict emphasis on basic skills instruction; and that in the schools they are involved with, Chapter 1 is working effectively to promote positive changes in basic skills achievement in the students. Ten out of eleven also agreed that the information describing the guidelines for monitoring the Chapter 1 program were clear and specific.

Nine out of eleven respondents indicated that they encountered difficulty in the implementation of the staff resource model, and that the schools experienced difficulty involving parents in the implementation of the basic skills program. All respondents reported that the schools they work with have difficulty maintaining compliance with program guidelines. The educational specialists listed a total of 15 different areas as causing problems with compliance with 13 areas reported by only one person and two areas listed by two specialists.

All educational specialists agreed with a statement indicating that inservice training would increase their effectiveness in providing support and direction to the Chapter 1 schools. From a list of seven areas, a relatively large number of respondents indicated a desire for further inservice training in the areas of

classroom management techniques (N = 6), assertiveness training (N = 6), the Total Math Program (N = 5), the language experience approach (N = 4), and oral language development (N = 4).

When asked to provide recommendations for improving Chapter 1, three respondents suggested direct communication from central office to Area staff and one specialist requested that they receive copies of most of the memos that are sent to Chapter 1 schools. Two educational specialists also suggested that the conditions for providing school group inservices be improved.

Parent survey. In general, the parents expressed positive feelings about the operation and impact of the Chapter 1 program. Ninety-eight percent of the responding parents agreed that the use of computers to help students in reading, writing, and mathematics is effective and that the provision of Chapter 1 services through paraprofessionals at the secondary level met the needs of eligible students. A relatively high percentage of parents (97%) also indicated that the Full-Day Basic Skills program is an effective method for improving children's reading and math.

Relatively low agreement rates were provided for statements indicating that the evaluation results of the Chapter 1 program had been explained to them (79%), and that they had been given a chance to make recommendations about the Chapter 1 project (80%). Twenty-eight percent of the parents disagreed with a statement indicating that having two teachers, with groups of 16 students each, in a single regular-sized classroom is not harmful to instruction, and 29 percent did not approve of the requirement that eligible elementary Chapter 1 students not receive direct instruction in objectives for social studies, science, and health. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that they did not receive enough direction and support from the parent aide. Thirty percent did not agree that the communication between parents and the parent aide is satisfactory, although 93 percent indicated that the parent aide support should be continued.

The parents were presented with a matrix which allowed them to indicate their training experience and/or needs in three areas. Forty-six percent of the parents reported that they had received training in helping children at home in reading and mathematics and 44 percent indicated a need for training in this area. Fifty-four percent responded that they had received information about the Chapter 1 program and 34 percent indicated a need for more information. Only 35 percent reported receiving training in conducting parent meetings and activities for parents, although 44 percent indicated a need for training in this area.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Achievement Gains for 1984-85

1. Has the district's Chapter 1 program produced achievement gains beyond what would have been expected without the operation of such a program?

While the overall district public school reading and mathematics achievement gains for 1984-85 are not substantial, it appears that the project was generally successful. With the exception of the second and fourth grades, positive gains in reading were achieved at all grade levels. The negative results at second and fourth grades reflect districtwide achievement patterns and are reported by several other districts in the State that use the Stanford. Positive gains in mathematics were achieved at all grade levels except for a slight negative result in the fourth grade. Achievement results in language showed positive gains in grades five and six with a negative result at the fourth grade. Since any gain greater than zero would indicate that the Chapter 1 pupils had improved their standing with respect to the normative population, the overall public schools' results indicate that the Chapter 1 program had a generally positive effect on the participants' achievement.

2. Did the program have similar impact on reading and mathematics?

The reported overall public school reading and mathematics achievement results for grades kindergarten through eleven would indicate that the Chapter 1 program was having a similar impact in both reading and mathematics. The overall reading gain is slightly higher than the overall mathematics gain but it is not clear whether this is a program effect or the result of inflated gains in the secondary grades.

3. How did the Staff Resource, Pullout, and Extended School Day instructional models used in the public elementary schools compare with the achievement gains realized in the Full-Day Basic Skills model?

Most participants in the Elementary and Chapter 1/SCE components received Chapter 1 services through the Full-Day Basic Skills model. A small number of students who could not be assigned to a Full-Day Basic Skills class were provided with supplementary instruction through one of three contingency models (Staff Resource, Pullout, Extended School Day). An attempt was made to compare the achievement gains made by participants in the contingency models with the gains made by students who participated in the Full-Day Basic Skills model. Only in the Elementary component Staff Resource model did a sufficient number of students participate to allow such a comparison. In reading, participants in the Staff Resource model achieved a slightly higher gain than the Full-Day participants, while in mathematics, the Full-Day participants reported a greater gain than the Staff

Resource students. It may be that these findings are not a result of differences in the models, but rather a function of differences in the student populations due to factors at the school level that influence student placement.

4. How did the achievement gains made at the elementary grade levels compare to gains made at the secondary grade levels?

Compared to the elementary grade level (K - 6), the secondary grade level (7 - 11) gains were greater in both reading and mathematics. The secondary grade level reading gain is substantially greater than the elementary level gain score. The difference in mathematics gains, although not as substantial, is relatively large. However, as stated in the Results and Discussion section, the secondary level gains should be interpreted cautiously due to selection procedures which may have increased the regression effect on these gain scores.

5. Did the females differ from the males in the achievement gains made in both reading and mathematics?

Female reading achievement gains were higher than the male reading achievement gains overall as well as at the elementary level and the secondary level. Overall and elementary level mathematics achievement gains were greater for the female participants. However, at the secondary level the males achieved a greater NCE gain in mathematics than the female participants. Female students appeared to benefit more from participation in the Chapter 1 program than the male students except in mathematics at the secondary level.

Monitoring Activities

Data from both site visitation cycles revealed that, on the whole, the program was functioning smoothly. There were some problems which were reported to project personnel at conference sessions following each of the visitations.

ECIA, Chapter 1 Personnel and Parent Survey

Results of the survey indicate an overall high degree of program satisfaction across all six respondent groups. Principals reported that, in general, little difficulty was encountered in planning and implementing the Chapter 1 program. The Chapter 1 planning process and the adequacy and clarity of information provided to facilitate program planning received favorable ratings by most administrators. However, more than half of the principals reported that they experienced difficulty obtaining parental involvement in the planning of their program. Similarily, area educational specialists reported difficulty involving parents in the implementation of the program. A relatively large number of administrators also noted that they experienced problems in developing their program because of the late arrival of test scores used to determine student eligibility

and because of difficulty experienced in recruiting suitable Chapter 1 personnel.

The positive influence of the Chapter 1 program on student achievement was reported by administrators, teachers, educational specialists, and parents. The 16:1 student teacher ratio used in the elementary schools Full-Day Basic Skills classes was rated as effective by virtually all teachers even though a high percentage indicated that having two teachers, with 16 students each, in a single regular-sized classroom was harmful to instruction. The vast majority of teachers, however, indicated that they preferred to remain in Chapter 1 during the next school year even if it were necessary to share a classroom.

Chapter 1 personnel were provided with an opportunity to indicate their desire and/or need for inservice training. Two general areas of inservice were noted most frequently. The need/desire for inservice in the area of computer education and computer software was reported by administrators, elementary teachers, and secondary aides. Responses from principals, teachers, and educational specialists also indicate the need/desire for additional inservice training in the area of the language experience approach and oral language development.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the Chapter 1 project, as implemented during the 1984-85 school year, be continued.

2. It is recommmended that specific attention be given to the reading instruction in the second and fourth grades. It should be noted, however, that there also may be non-programmatic influences affecting reading test results at these grade levels.

3. It is recommended that additional emphasis be placed on mathematics in the fourth grade.

4. It is recommended that additional emphasis be placed on language development at the fourth grade level.

5. It is recommended that some attention should be given to those factors which influence the differential performance of male and female students at particular grades.

6. Additional effort shoud be made to identify methods to further involve parents in the planning and implementation of the Chapter 1 project.

7. Attention should be given to the difficulty that principals experience in recruiting suitable teachers and aides.

8. The situation in which two teachers, each with 16 students, teach in a single regular-sized classroom should be reviewed in order to determine if adjustments can be made to reduce the negative effects resulting from this situation.

9. The inservice needs/desires of Chapter 1 personnel should be identified and appropriate inservice training provided. Survey data indicated a need for inservice training in the areas of computer education, computer software, language experience, and oral language development.

APPENDIX A

ECIA, Chapter 1 Schools, 1984-85

ECIA, CHAPTER 1 SCHOOLS

1984-85

Schoolwide Component (elementary)

Lewis, A. L.
Miramar
Riverside
Wheatley, P.

Elementary Component

Allapattah
Arcola Lake
Bel-Aire
Blanton
Brentwood
Bright
Broadmoor
Buena Vista
Bunche Park
Campbell Drive
Caribbean
Carol City
Chapman
Citrus Grove
Comstock
Coral Way
Crowder
Douglas
Drew
Dunbar
Earlington Heights
Edison Park
Evans
Fienberg
Floral Heights
Florida City
Golden Glades
Hialeah
Holmes
King
Kinloch Park
Lake Stevens
Lakeview
Leisure City
Liberty City
Little River
Lorah Park
Ludlam
Melrose
Meadowlane
Merrick
Miami Gardens
Miami Park
Moton
Myrtle Grove
Naranja
North Carol City
North County
North Glade
Olinda
Opa Locka
Orchard Villa
Parkview
Pharr
Pine Villa
Poinciana Park
Rainbow Park
Santa Clara
Shadowlawn
South Hialeah
Southside
Tucker
Walters
West Homestead
West Little River
Westview
Young

Chapter 1/SCE Component

Air Base
Auburndale
Biscayne
Carver
Coconut Grove
Crestview
Dupuis
Earhart
Fairlawn
Flamingo
Franklin
Fulford
Kensington Park
Miami Heights
Milam
Morningside
Natural Bridge
North Hialeah
North Twin Lakes
Olympia Heights
Palm Lakes
Palm Springs
Parkway
Perrine
Redondo
Richmond
Scott Lake
Seminole
Shenandoah
Silver Bluff
Skyway
South Miami
South Miami Heights
Sylvania Heights
Twin Lakes

Secondary School Component

Middle/Junior High Schools

Allapattah
Brownsville
Campbell Drive
Carol City
Carver
Citrus Grove
Drew/Middle
Filer
Hialeah
Homestead
Jefferson
Kinloch Park
Lake Stevens
Lee
Madison
Mann
Mays
Miami Edison
Miami Springs
Nautilus
North Dade
Parkway
Rivieria
Shenandoah
South Miami
Thomas
Washington
Westview

Senior High Schools

American
Homestead
Miami Beach
Miami Carol City
Miami Central
Miami Edison
Miami Jackson
Miami Norland
Miami Northwestern
Miami Senior
Miami Southridge
Miami Springs
South Dade
South Miami

Alternative School Component

Cope Center - North
Cope Center - South
MacArthur - North
MacArthur - South
Jan Mann Opportunity - North
J.R.E. Lee Youth Opportunity - South

Non-Public School Component

Corpus Christi
Holy Redeemer
Immaculate Conception
Our Lady of Perpetual Help
Sacred Heart
St. Francis Xavier
St. John the Apostle
St. Monica's
St. Peter & Paul

Center for Neglected or Delinquent Youth Component

Alternative Home Care Program
Better Outlook Center
Boystown of Florida
Catholic Home for Children
Children's Home Society of Florida
Dade County Jail-Department of Rehabilitation
Dade Juvenile Detention
Dade Group Treatment Home
Dade Halfway House
Florida Baptist Children's Home
Gladeview Emergency Shelter
Here's Help
Metatherapy Institute
Miami Bridge - Catholic Community Service Inc.
Village South Inc.

APPENDIX B

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Student Selection Criteria

1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1
Student Selection Criteria

Following are the primary student selection criteria for the 1984-85 Chapter 1 project. Where appropriate, special selection criteria are to be used when the primary test score is not available or is markedly inappropriate.

Schoolwide Component

All students enrolled in each schoolwide project are eligible to participate in the supplementary program concept. No distinction will be made among students relative to eligibility.

Elementary School Component

Kindergarten	The 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 program does not include a component for kindergarten students.
Grade 1	Students who scored at the 20th percentile or below on the "Listening to Words and Stories" subtest of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT), Level 1 AND who also scored at the 49th percentile or below on the "Mathematics" subtest of the SESAT as administered in April/May, 1984.
Grade 2	Students who scored at the 20th percentile or below on the "Reading Comprehension" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test S.A.T. AND who also scored at the 49th percentile or below on the "Mathematics Computation and Applications" subtest of the S.A.T. as administered in April/May, 1984.
Grades 3 through 6	Students who scored at the 20th percentile or below on the "Reading Comprehension" subtest of the S.A.T. AND who also scored at the 49th percentile or below on the "Mathematics Applications" subtest of the S.A.T. as administered in April/May, 1984.

Chapter 1/SCE Component

Kindergarten	The 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 program does not include a component for kindergarten students.
Grade 1	Students who scored at the 20th percentile or below (1-15 SCE, 16-20 Chapter 1) on the "Listening to Words and Stories" subtest of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT), Level 1 AND who also scored at the 49th percentile or below on the "Mathematics" subtest of the SESAT as administered in April/May, 1984.
Grade 2	Students who scored at the 20th percentile or below (1-15 SCE, 16-20 Chapter 1) on the "Reading Comprehension" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test S.A.T. AND who also scored at the 49th percentile or below on the "Mathematics Computation and Applications" subtest of the S.A.T. as administered in April/May, 1984.
Grades 3 through 6	Students who scored at the 20th percentile or below (1-15 SCE, 16-20 Chapter 1) on the "Reading Comprehension" subtest of the S.A.T. AND who also scored at the 49th percentile or below on the "Mathematics Applications" subtest of the S.A.T. as administered in April/May, 1984.

Secondary School Component

Grades 5 through 10	READING - students who scored in stanines 1 and 2 on the "Reading Comprehension" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test as administered in April/May, 1984.
	MATHEMATICS - students who scored in stanines 1 and 2 on the "Mathematics Applications" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test as administered in April/May, 1984.

Alternative School Component

All Grades	Student would have attended a regular Chapter 1 school if not attending the alternative school.
Grades 6 through 12	READING - students who scored at or below the 25th percentile on the "Reading Comprehension" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test as administered in April/May, 1984.
Grades 6 through 10	MATHEMATICS - students who scored at or below the 25th percentile on the "Mathematics Applications" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test as administered in April/May, 1984.
Grades 11 and 12	MATHEMATICS - students who scored at or below the 25th percentile on the "Mathematics" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test as administered in April/May, 1984.

Non-Public School Component

All Grades	Student would have attended a regular Chapter 1 public school if not attending the non-public school.
Kindergarten	The 1984-85 ECIA, Chapter 1 program does not include a component for kindergarten students.
Grade 1	Students who scored at the 20th percentile or below on the "Listening to Words and Stories" subtest of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT), Level 1 AND who also scored at the 49th percentile or below on the "Mathematics" subtest of the SESAT as administered in April/May, 1984.
Grade 2	Students who scored at the 20th percentile or below on the "Reading Comprehension" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test (S.A.T.) AND who also scored at the 49th percentile or below on the "Mathematics Computation and Applications" subtest of the S.A.T. as administered in April/May, 1984.
Grades 3 through 6	Students who scored at the 20th percentile or below on the "Reading Comprehension" subtest of the S.A.T. AND who also scored at the 49th percentile or below on the "Mathematics Applications" subtest of the S.A.T. as administered in April/May, 1984.
Grades 7 through 10	READING - students who scored in stanines 1 and 2 on the "Reading Comprehension" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test as administered in April/May, 1984. MATHEMATICS - students who scored in stanines 1 and 2 on the "Mathematics Applications" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test as administered in April/May, 1984.

Center for Neglected or Delinquent Youth Component

Kindergarten	Students who score at or below the 30th percentile on the Cooperative Preschool Inventory as administered in September, 1984 or at the time of entry into the program.
Grade 1	READING - students who score at or below the 25th percentile on the "Listening to Words and Stories" subtest of the Stanford Early School Achievement Test, 2nd edition as administered in April, 1984. MATHEMATICS - students who score at or below the 25th percentile on the "Mathematics" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test, 2nd edition as administered in April, 1984.
Grades 2 through 6	READING - students who score at or below the 25th percentile on the "Reading Comprehension" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test, 7th edition as administered in April, 1984.
Grade 2	MATHEMATICS - students who score at or below the 25th percentile on the "Mathematics Computation and Applications" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test, 7th edition as administered in April, 1984.
Grades 3 through 6	MATHEMATICS - students who score at or below the 25th percentile on the "Mathematics Applications" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test, 7th edition as administered in April, 1984.
Grades 7 through 12	READING - students who score at or below the 25th percentile on the "Reading Comprehension" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test, 7th edition as administered in April, 1984.

Center for Neglected or Delinquent Youth Component (continued)

Grades 7 through 10	MATHEMATICS - students who score at or below the 25th percentile on the "Mathematics Applications" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test, 7th edition as administered in April, 1984.
Grades 11 and 12	MATHEMATICS - students who score at or below the 25th percentile on the "Mathematics" subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test, 7th edition as administered in April, 1984.

APPENDIX C

Supplementary Program Models

SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRAM MODELS

In accordance with the statutory requirement that Chapter 1 funds be used to provide instructional activities which are supplementary to those provided through regular programs, the School Board has approved specific supplementary program models for implementation at the elementary and secondary grade levels respectively. The following program models are the ONLY supplementary plans which may be implemented:

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

1. Schoolwide Projects

   a. Chapter 1 and local supplementary funding from Part 1 of the budget will be used to reduce class size for all students in the 4 most economically disadvantaged elementary schools (not to exceed 16 students per teacher).

   b. All students will receive instruction in all curriculum areas based on individual needs.

   c. All students will receive grades in all curriculum areas in which instruction is presented (e.g. basic skills in conjunction with instruction in other learning areas such as science, social studies, health and safety, enrichments, electives).

   d. Although instruction is not limited to basic skills, all teachers should be encouraged to provide parallel emphasis on the mastery of basic skills in conjunction with instruction in other learning areas such as science, social studies, etc.

2. Full-Day, Self-Contained Basic Skills Model

   a. In this model, locally-funded and Chapter 1-funded teachers EACH instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in separate classrooms with a maximum of 16 students. Although space limitations may require that two teachers and 32 students be assigned to a single classroom, each teacher will be instructionally accountable for his/her specific group of 16 students. "Turn" teaching is not permitted.

   b. This model differs from other models in that it provides a full day of basic skills instruction to eligible students in grades 1-6. Since students will not receive direct instruction in objectives for social studies, science and health, parents must be notified that report card grades will be given only in the areas of language arts and mathematics plus enrichment and elective subjects. In this regard, the Bureau of Education will provide all Chapter 1 schools with both a standard "parent" letter and guidlines for the preparation of report cards.

c. Approximately one-half of the school day will be devoted to individualized instruction in reading, language arts, and mathematics using a diagnostic/ prescriptive approach. The remainder of the day will include language experience activities, oral language development activities, and instruction from specialists in physical education, music, art, and other special electives. At grade levels where the services of specialists are not available, only the locally-funded teacher should provide instruction in the enrichment/elective areas to the Chapter 1 students. Chapter 1-funded teachers may provide instruction in communications and mathematics only.

d. Both the "language experience" and "oral language development" activities will provide students with opportunities to apply and reinforce the basic skills. In order to assist <u>all</u> teachers in the full-day, basic skills program to effectively instruct in the language experience and oral language development strategies, the following two resources will be available:

(1) lesson plans which incorporate concepts from science, social studies, and health in the effort to reinforce communications and mathematics skills.

(2) comprehensive, structured staff development activities provided through staff from the Bureau of Education and Chapter 1 project staff in the respective areas.

e. <u>Chapter 1-funded</u> teachers for this model will be allocated on the basis of 1 teacher for 32 eligible students. The number of locally-funded teachers required to participate in this program model <u>must</u> be at least equal to the number which would have been assigned to the participating Chapter 1 students if no Chapter 1 program existed.

<u>NOTE</u>: Eligible students who cannot be assigned to a full-day, self-contained basic skills class due to parent request, grade level distribution of eligible students, minority isolation, etc., <u>MUST</u> receive supplementary instruction in the basic skills through at least one of the following contingency models.

3. <u>Staff Resource Model</u>

a. In this model, Chapter 1-funded teacher aides/assistants will instruct <u>only</u> Chapter 1-eligible students in regular classrooms which contain both Chapter 1 and non-Chapter 1-eligible students.

b. The Chapter 1 aide will provide assistance to Chapter 1 students in this model in the basic skills only.

c. Instruction provided by the Chapter 1 aide in this setting <u>must</u> be under the direction and supervision of the locally-funded (regular) teacher.

4. Extended School Day Model

   a. Chapter 1-funded hourly teachers will instruct Chapter-eligible students exclusively in the basic skills only in pre or post school hours.

   b. Systematic articulation between the regular teachers (regular day) and the Chapter 1 teachers in the extended day model must be implemented.

   c. Chapter 1 students who participate in this model will receive instruction and grades in all other learning areas from the regular teacher.

5. Pullout Model

   a. Chapter 1-eligible students will receive instruction in the basic skills only from Chapter 1-funded teachers or aides in specifically designated areas outside the regular classroom during the regular school day.

   b. Systematic articulation between the regular teachers and the Chapter 1 personnel must be implemented.

   c. If aides are used to implement the pullout model, supervision of their activities by certified personnel must be provided.

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The following program design models have been identified as those which meet the requirements of "supplementary instruction" for secondary schools. Each Chapter 1 junior or senior high school may choose one or a combination of these models for use in the design and implementation of its Chapter 1 program:

1. Homogeneous Laboratory or Classroom - (In Class)

   a. One locally-funded teacher and one Chapter 1-funded teacher aide will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in a single laboratory or classroom.

   b. The regular classroom teacher is responsible for the planning and evaluation of each student's instructional program. This may be demonstrated through the individualized diagnostic-prescriptive instructional management records for each student.

   c. The number of Chapter 1 students enrolled per period in this model must not exceed the number which is assigned per period to non-Chapter 1 teachers in the same subject area and grade.

2. Split Laboratory or Classroom - (Replacement)

   a. Locally-funded and Chapter 1-funded teachers will each instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in separate classrooms.

   b. The number of Chapter 1 students in each teacher's class should be approximately the same and the total of the two classes should not exceed the average for non-Chapter 1 classes in the same subject.

   c. Each teacher may implement his/her own individualized diagnostic-prescriptive program with his/her own Chapter 1 students. No common or shared diagnosis, prescription, and assessment between the local and Chapter 1-funded teachers are required.

NOTE: This model can be used on a minimum basis only due to the limitation in per pupil funding of $125.

3. Staff Resource - (In Class)

   a. Chapter 1-funded personnel (teachers and/or paraprofessionals) will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in heterogeneously grouped classrooms.

   b. Instruction provided by the Chapter 1 personnel in this setting must be under the supervision and direction of the locally-funded teacher.

c. The responsibility of the regular classroom teacher for the planning and evaluation of each student's instructional program may be demonstrated through the individualized diagnostic-prescriptive instructional management records for each student.

d. The number of students enrolled per period in this model must not exceed on the average the number enrolled in classes in the same subject and level which have no Chapter 1-eligible students.

4. Extended School Day - (Add-On)

a. Chapter 1 teachers will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in pre or post school hours.

b. The number of students assigned per Chapter 1 teacher per session in this model should not exceed the number assigned per period to locally-funded teachers in the same subject during the regular day. High priority should be given, however, to substantially lowering the teacher-student ratio during the Chapter 1 extended day instruction.

c. Systematic articulation between the locally-funded teachers (regular day) and the Chapter 1 personnel in the extended day program should be implemented.

5. Double Dosage

a. Chapter 1-eligible students will receive a second period of instruction in their area of eligibility (reading/mathematics) in lieu of an elective subject.

b. A locally funded teacher must be assigned to each class of Chapter 1 students who are being scheduled for "double dosage" treatment.

c. Chapter 1-funded personnel must be utilized in accordance with models 1, 2, or 3 for at least one of the two periods in which the Chapter 1 students are scheduled for "double dosage"..

d. If Chapter 1 funding permits, models 1, 2, or 3 may be implemented for both periods of the "double dosage".

1. Homogeneous Laboratory or Classroom - (In-Class)

   a. One locally-funded teacher and one Chapter 1-funded teacher will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in a single laboratory or classroom.

   b. The regular classroom teacher is technically responsible for the planning and evaluation of each student's instructional program but this may be demonstrated through the individualized diagnostic-prescriptive instructional management records for each student.

   c. The number of Chapter 1 students enrolled per period in this model must not exceed the number which is assigned per period to non-Chapter 1 teachers in the same subject area.

   d. If the Chapter 1 allocation permits, hourly and/or full time paraprofessionals may be employed under Chapter 1 funding to assist in the implementation of this model.

2. Split Laboratory or Classroom - (Replacement)

   a. One locally-funded and one Chapter 1-funded teacher will each instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in separate classrooms.

   b. The number of Chapter 1 students in each teacher's class should be approximately the same and the total of the two classes should not exceed the average for non-Chapter 1 classes in the same subject.

   c. Each teacher may implement his/her own individualized diagnostic-prescriptive program with his/her own Chapter 1 students. No common or shared diagnosis, prescription, and assessment between the local and Chapter 1-funded teachers are required.

   d. If the Chapter 1 allocation permits, hourly and/or full-time Chapter 1-funded paraprofessionals may be employed for assignment to the locally-funded teacher or Chapter 1-funded teacher or both.

3. Staff Resource - (In-Class)

   a. Chapter 1-funded personnel (teachers and/or paraprofessionals) will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in hetergeneously grouped classrooms.

   b. Instruction provided by the Chapter 1 personnel in this setting must be under the supervision and direction of the locally-funded teacher.

c. The responsibility of the regular classroom teacher for the planning and evaluation of each student's instructional program may be demonstrated through the individualized diagnostic-prescriptive instructional management records for each student.

d. The number of students enrolled per period in this model must not exceed on the average the number enrolled in classes in the same subject and level which have no Chapter 1-eligible students.

4. Extended School Day - (Add-On)

a. Chapter 1 personnel (teachers and paraprofessionals) will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in pre or post school hours.

b. The number of students assigned per Chapter 1 teacher per session in this model should not exceed the number assigned per period to locally-funded teachers in the same subject during the regular day. High priority should be given, however, to substantially lowering the teacher-student ratio during the Chapter 1 extended day instruction.

c. Systematic articulation between the locally-funded teachers (regular day) and the Chapter 1 personnel in the extended day program should be implemented.

5. Pullout (Elementary Grades Only)

a. Chapter 1 teachers will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively by "Pulling" them from the regular classroom for instruction in another facility.

b. The number of students instructed per session by the Chapter 1 teacher in this model should be significantly lower than the number of non-Chapter 1 students instructed by the regular classroom teacher.

c. The regular classroom teacher is responsible for diagnosing the instructional needs of each student who participates in this Chapter 1 supplementary activity. A structured process of articulation between the regular and Chapter 1 teacher must be utilized (diagnosis, prescription, assessment).

d. If the Chapter 1 allocation permits, hourly and/or full-time paraprofessionals may be employed under Chapter 1 funding to assist in the implementation of this model.

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

1. Homogeneous Laboratory or Classroom - (In-Class)

   a. One locally-funded teacher and one Chapter 1-funded teacher will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in a single laboratory or classroom.

   b. The regular classroom teacher is technically responsible for the planning and evaluation of each student's instructional program but this may be demonstrated through the individualized diagnostic-prescriptive instructional management records for each student.

   c. The number of Chapter 1 students enrolled per period in this model must not exceed the number which is assigned per period to non-Chapter 1 teachers in the same subject area.

   d. If the Chapter 1 allocation permits, hourly and/or full time paraprofessionals may be employed under Chapter 1 funding to assist in the implementation of this model.

2. Split Laboratory or Classroom - (Replacement)

   a. One locally-funded and one Chapter 1-funded teacher will each instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in separate classrooms.

   b. The number of Chapter 1 students in each teacher's class should be approximately the same and the total of the two classes should not exceed the average for non-Chapter 1 classes in the same subject.

   c. Each teacher may implement his/her own individualized diagnostic-prescriptive program with his/her own Chapter 1 students. No common or shared diagnosis, prescription, and assessment between the local and Chapter 1-funded teachers are required.

   d. If the Chapter 1 allocation permits, hourly and/or full-time Chapter 1-funded paraprofessionals may be employed for assignment to the locally-funded teacher or Chapter 1-funded teacher or both.

3. Staff Resource - (In Class)

   a. Chapter 1-funded personnel (teachers and/or paraprofessionals) will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in heterogeneously grouped classrooms.

   b. Instruction provided by the Chapter 1 personnel in this setting must be under the supervision and direction of the locally-funded teacher.

c. The responsibility of the regular classroom teacher for the planning and evaluation of each student's instructional program may be demonstrated through the individualized diagnostic-prescriptive instructional management records for each student.

d. The number of students enrolled per period in this model must not exceed on the average the number enrolled in classes in the same subject and level which have no Chapter 1-eligible students.

5. Pullout (Elementary Grades Only)

a. Chapter 1 teachers will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively by "Pulling" them from the regular classroom for instruction in another facility.

b. The number of students instructed per session by the Chapter 1 teacher in this model should be significantly lower than the number of non-Chapter 1 students instructed by the regular classroom teacher.

c. The regular classroom teacher is responsible for diagnosing the instructional needs of each student who participates in this Chapter 1 supplementary activity. A structured process of articulation between the regular and Chapter 1 teacher must be utilized (diagnosis, prescription, assessment).

d. If the Chapter 1 allocation permits, hourly and/or full-time paraprofessionals may be employed under Chapter 1 funding to assist in the implementation of this model.

CENTERS FOR NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT YOUTH

1. Homogeneous Laboratory or Classroom - (In-Class)

   a. One locally-funded teacher and one Chapter 1-funded teacher will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in a single laboratory or classroom.

   b. The regular classroom teacher is technically responsible for the planning and evaluation of each student's instructional program but this may be demonstrated through the individualized diagnostic-prescriptive instructional management records for each student.

   c. The number of Chapter 1 students enrolled per period in this model must not exceed the number which is assigned per period to non-Chapter 1 teachers in the same subject area.

   d. If the Chapter 1 allocation permits, hourly and/or full time paraprofessionals may be employed under Chapter 1 funding to assist in the implementation of this model.

2. Split Laboratory or Classroom - (Replacement)

   a. One locally-funded and one Chapter 1-funded teacher will each instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in separate classrooms.

   b. The number of Chapter 1 students in each teacher's class should be approximately the same and the total of the two classes should not exceed the average for non-Chapter 1 classes in the same subject.

   c. Each teacher may implement his/her own individualized diagnostic-prescriptive program with his/her own Chapter 1 students. No common or shared diagnosis, prescription, and assessment between the local and Chapter 1-funded teachers are required.

   d. If the Chapter 1 allocation permits, hourly and/or full-time Chapter 1-funded paraprofessionals may be employed for assignment to the locally-funded teacher or Chapter 1-funded teacher or both.

3. Staff Resource - (In-Class)

   a. Chapter 1-funded personnel (teachers and/or paraprofessionals) will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in heterogeneously grouped classrooms.

   b. Instruction provided by the Chapter 1 personnel in this setting must be under the supervision and direction of the locally-funded teacher.

c. The responsibility of the regular classroom teacher for the planning and evaluation of each student's instructional program may be demonstrated through the individualized diagnostic-prescriptive instructional management records for each student.

d. The number of students enrolled per period in this model must not exceed on the average the number enrolled in classes in the same subject and level which have no Chapter 1-eligible students.

4. Extended School Day - (Add-On)

a. Chapter 1 personnel (teachers and paraprofessionals) will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in pre or post school hours.

b. The number of students assigned per Chapter 1 teacher per session in this model should not exceed the number assigned per period to locally-funded teachers in the same subject during the regular day. High priority should be given, however, to substantially lowering the teacher-student ratio during the Chapter 1 extended day instruction.

c. Systematic articulation between the locally-funded teachers (regular day) and the Chapter 1 personnel in the extended day program should be implemented.

5. Pullout (Elementary Grades Only)

a. Chapter 1 teachers will instruct Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively by "Pulling" them from the regular classroom for instruction in another facility.

b. The number of students instructed per session by the Chapter 1 teacher in this model should be significantly lower than the number of non-Chapter 1 students instructed by the regular classroom teacher.

c. The regular classroom teacher is responsible for diagnosing the instructional needs of each student who participates in this Chapter 1 supplementary activity. A structured process of articulation between the regular and Chapter 1 teacher must be utilized (diagnosis, prescription, assessment).

d. If the Chapter 1 allocation permits, hourly and/or full-time paraprofessionals may be employed under Chapter 1 funding to assist in the implementation of this model.

APPENDIX D

Explanation of Regression

Explanation of Regression

Regression occurs when multiple measurements are made of any phenomenon. Any observed measurement or score has, as parts of the score, the actual value of the phenomenon being measured (such as achievement) and some random factors that may be the result of the measurement instrument not being perfect, variations in the object or person being measured, variations in the environment, or other unknown random factors. These factors, which are not the object of the measurement, are considered to be error. This error is always a part of the measurement or test score. As more measurements are taken the error becomes less important and the measurements tend to approach the actual value of the phenomenon. The best representation of the actual value of the phenomenon is the average of the measurements that were taken or the mean. Thus, as more measurements are taken, each measurement tends to approach or regress towards the mean. This concept of regression is quite important for testing and even more so for Chapter 1 achievement data. In any large group of scores, those scores furthest from the mean would be expected, on repeated testing, to move the greatest distance toward the mean. This is because those scores furthest from the mean are considered to have a greater amount of error as part of the score which is what put them far from the mean in the first place.

APPENDIX E

Individual School Achievement Test Results

Air Base Elementary - 0041

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	1	-2.3	1	9.1		
2	4	-2.2	3	8.1		
3	4	6.7	4	3.3		
4	3	2.3	3	8.4	3	-1.2
5	1	-5.0	1	1.7	1	14.8
6	3	3.4	4	-1.7	3	6.6

Allapattah Elementary - 0081

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
3	40	7.4	38	11.0		
4	42	-5.0	40	0.0	41	-6.7
5	42	-6.8	41	-1.0	41	-1.2
6	35	-3.9	37	0.2	37	2.5

Arcola Lake Elementary - 0101

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	19	4.8	19	2.4		
2	14	0.2	14	6.6		
3	15	2.1	14	1.5		
4	19	-3.3	19	-1.4	19	-4.9
5	41	0.8	42	12.0	42	1.8
6	50	2.0	48	0.7	49	0.9

Auburndale Elementary - 0121

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	2	10.9	2	19.4		
3	5	1.8	5	7.7		
4	1	-6.8	1	-24.1	1	-24.2
5	9	3.0	9	7.0	9	0.6
6	4	-1.0	4	2.3	4	-3.0

Bel-Aire Elementary - 0261

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	25	-2.7	25	-1.5		
2	21	-0.8	21	15.7		
3	29	4.4	29	4.4		
4	24	-0.6	24	1.8	24	-6.2

Biscayne Elementary - 0321

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
3	1	2.3	1	12.3		
4	2	5.5	2	7.3	2	-2.6
5	1	-1.9	1	-8.8	1	9.9
6	2	5.0	2	6.6	2	16.3

Blanton Elementary - 0401

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	15	16.5	16	7.0		
2	8	-4.4	9	-5.3		
3	23	3.2	23	3.2		
4	33	0.8	31	-1.7	32	-0.6
5	33	0.9	33	5.1	33	1.0

Brentwood Elementary - 0461

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	25	9.6	25	5.1		
2	13	-3.3	13	1.9		
3	20	2.6	20	-7.3		
4	20	-6.7	20	-3.6	20	-4.2
5	27	0.4	27	1.5	27	-0.7
6	22	-4.4	22	4.3	22	1.6

J. H. Bright Elementary - 0481

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	7	2.1	6	14.0		
2	2	-1.4	2	10.2		
3	9	-1.3	9	-14.7		
4	21	0.6	21	3.2	20	-6.0
5	9	9.0	9	20.4	9	-6.0
6	9	2.6	9	-6.0	9	-7.0

Broadmoor Elementary - 0521

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	47	2.8	48	11.9		
2	25	-2.3	25	4.5		
3	49	2.0	49	-0.5		

Buena Vista Elementary - 0601

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	20	4.6	20	-3.6		
2	11	-8.6	12	-0.8		
3	51	9.6	52	2.2		

Bunche Park Elementary - 0641

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	14	-1.4	14	-7.2		
2	9	-2.0	9	-1.0		
3	10	-1.1	10	-0.4		
4	13	-1.1	11	4.7	12	2.0
5	3	7.9	3	8.1	3	-5.0
6	11	14.9	11	6.4	11	5.6

Campbell Drive Elementary - 0651

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	19	1.9	19	6.0		
2	9	-6.1	9	1.6		
3	1	2.3				
4	5	0.1	5	-2.2	5	0.6
5	25	-7.9	25	0.5	25	-11.2

Caribbean Elementary - 0661

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	13	-0.2	13	-3.3		
2	12	-1.4	12	-7.3		
3	18	-1.8	18	-3.6		
4	15	-2.7	15	-3.9	15	-3.3
5	27	-1.2	27	5.6	27	-0.5
6	31	10.9	30	10.4	31	6.8

Carol City Elementary - 0681

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	17	6.7	18	-1.6		
2	8	7.1	9	6.0		
3	26	2.7	25	-5.4		
4	20	-2.7	18	-1.3	21	-7.8
5	19	-1.4	20	6.5	20	2.6
6	54	5.8	55	5.8	54	1.2

Carver Elementary - 0721

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
2	6	-7.5	6	4.0		

Chapman Elementary - 0771

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	14	-5.3	13	-0.3		
2	15	6.6	15	1.5		
3	12	6.2	11	1.0		
4	12	-1.6	12	0.1	12	-2.6
5	23	-0.5	23	2.2	23	1.4

Citrus Grove Elementary - 0801

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	2	7.1	2	16.2		
2	10	5.5	7	13.4		
3	33	5.1	32	1.8		
4	38	5.6	36	7.9	37	-6.2
5	5	2.2	5	5.6	5	8.0

Coconut Grove Elementary - 0841

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
4	1	0.8	1	6.4	1	-4.8
5	2	-1.3	1	-1.6	2	2.9
6	2	4.4	2	5.0	2	3.2

Comstock Elementary - 0881

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	18	7.8	20	-2.8		
2	47	-4.8	47	-4.2		
3	39	-1.7	36	5.8		

Coral Way Elementary - 1121

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	1	-20.6	1	9.1		
2	12	4.0	11	20.4		
3	15	14.4	15	4.7		
4	8	6.6	7	-2.7	8	-5.3
5	19	6.2	19	4.4	19	4.6
6	22	0.1	22	1.9	21	-0.4

Crestview Elementary - 1161

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	3	6.0	3	15.5		
2	1	-10.0	1	4.5		
4	4	-0.3	4	4.5	4	-4.5
5	7	7.4	7	1.3	7	1.4
6	8	7.1	8	11.2	8	14.6

Douglas Elementary - 1361

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	26	11.4	28	6.1		
2	16	-5.2	16	-9.9		
3	50	5.2	47	3.0		

C. R. Drew Elementary - 1401

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	20	17.8	20	15.1		
2	15	-3.1	16	-1.4		
3	22	1.8	21	3.2		
4	27	3.1	26	0.3	28	-1.4
5	23	-0.7	23	6.1	24	5.9
6	21	-1.1	20	-0.8	19	1.3

Dunbar Elementary - 1441

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	22	-8.0	23	-5.0		
2	16	-4.6	16	-2.9		
3	48	2.6	51	-1.6		
4	38	0.7	37	-3.5	40	0.1
5	33	-1.6	33	-3.5	31	2.1
6	50	6.6	51	-0.6	51	0.3

Du Puis Elementary - 1481

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
3	4	3.3	4	4.1		
4	1	3.6	1	3.6	1	-1.6
5	5	6.4	5	1.3	5	7.6
6	3	4.1	3	7.2	3	2.1

Amelia Earhart Elementary - 1521

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
3	2	6.6	2	8.6		
4	1	-4.1	1	-3.7	1	12.6
5	2	-1.9	2	2.9	2	12.0
6	5	-3.2	5	16.0	5	-0.9

Earlington Heights Elementary - 1561

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	33	4.4	33	9.9		
2	33	-3.5	28	7.3		
3	35	6.5	33	0.1		

Edison Park Elementary - 1601

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	42	1.6	42	0.5		
2	23	1.3	20	7.6		
3	46	5.9	47	8.5		
4	68	1.9	68	3.6	64	-0.4

L. C. Evans Elementary - 1681

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	9	3.1	9	-6.0		
2	22	0.1	23	1.1		
3	31	4.3	30	-5.1		
4	11	-2.0	11	-8.0	11	-10.5
5	24	1.3	24	6.0	24	2.8
6	26	-2.4	26	-3.7	25	-2.4

Fairlawn Elementary - 1801

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
3	1	7.1	1	-27.0		
4	2	-2.8	2	-6.1	2	6.6
6	8	5.9	8	9.6	8	13.2

Fienberg Elementary - 0761

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	16	-1.4	16	12.6		
2	11	7.2	11	9.9		
3	25	4.3	26	1.6		
4	24	1.9	24	-1.0	22	-5.3
5	42	2.9	41	4.3	41	0.9
6	46	2.5	45	3.7	46	1.4

Flamingo Elementary - 1921

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	1	-13.6	1	2.2		
2	2	13.9	2	44.8		
3	1	13.7	1	4.9		
4	8	-7.0	8	-0.1	8	-9.7
5	3	-9.5	3	-3.4	3	-2.1
6	8	-0.6	8	0.2	8	12.2

Floral Heights Elementary - 1961

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	20	6.2	19	9.5		
2	12	-8.6	12	-14.5		
3	19	3.7	18	3.9		
4	9	-2.2	9	-7.6	11	-3.4
5	20	-2.5	20	5.4	20	2.1
6	15	1.4	15	-7.7	15	-1.3

Florida City Elementary - 2001

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	11	1.1	11	3.7		
2	14	-3.6	14	2.4		
3	31	-1.5	29	-4.9		
4	17	0.2	16	8.0	16	3.6
5	19	-0.6	19	5.2	19	1.6

Franklin Elementary - 2041

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
2	3	-13.5	3	-2.0		
3	5	1.7	5	2.8		
4	4	-1.1	4	-14.3	4	-0.1
5	13	0.4	13	-2.7	13	2.4
6	7	3.8	7	4.4	7	5.5

Fulford Elementary - 2081

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	3	-8.6	3	1.2		
2	1	-18.4	1	-30.0		
3	3	7.6	3	10.8		
4	3	-1.3	3	13.6	3	6.1
5	6	-7.7	6	3.3	5	2.7
6	1	12.4	1	-1.1	1	8.3

Golden Glades Elementary - 2161

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	6	-2.9	6	1.2		
2	1	-1.0	1	8.7		
3	4	4.6	4	3.5		
4	19	1.0	18	0.5	20	-7.0
5	19	-1.7	18	5.6	18	-1.3
6	24	0.9	22	-2.4	22	2.7

Hialeah Elementary - 2361

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	7	8.8	7	3.2		
2	5	-1.9	6	11.6		
3	3	6.0	3	-13.4		
4	6	1.9	6	-0.4	6	-8.1
5	12	8.0	12	13.0	11	6.4
6	23	9.2	23	7.3	23	1.5

Holmes Elementary - 2501

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	31	1.8	30	0.4		
2	6	2.7	6	-4.3		
3	15	9.2	15	7.8		
4	35	0.4	35	-5.1	35	-9.2
5	66	1.5	63	5.9	66	0.9
6	50	9.7	48	-0.7	50	-1.0

Kensington Park Elementary - 2661

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	3	-5.7	3	8.2		
2	1	-38.6	1	-35.8		
3	2	2.8	2	-29.1		
4	7	-1.5	7	8.5	5	12.4
5	8	4.3	8	0.1	8	5.5

M. L. King Elementary - 2761

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	26	-13.6	27	-11.4		
2	19	-8.1	19	-8.1		
3	24	9.9	24	-3.7		

Kinloch Park Elementary - 2781

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	8	4.6	8	8.1		
2	11	2.9	11	10.8		
3	5	2.2	5	2.3		
4	17	2.8	18	3.4	18	5.6
5	10	9.6	10	7.8	10	14.3

Lake Stevens Elementary - 2801

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	6	-1.2	6	6.8		
2	11	0.8	11	-6.5		
3	11	2.9	11	9.3		
4	18	-1.4	18	0.5	18	2.8
5	21	6.1	22	0.0	24	1.7
6	19	2.1	19	5.0	18	8.2

Lakeview Elementary - 2821

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	14	3.1	14	0.1		
2	30	0.2	30	5.9		
3	31	-2.5	31	-2.0		
4	35	3.2	35	8.4	35	3.9
5	24	-2.8	24	1.8	24	2.5
6	36	3.4	36	-1.0	35	2.0

Leisure City Elementary - 2901

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	14	-17.6	14	-5.7		
2	5	-1.6	5	15.0		
3	6	0.4	6	1.0		
4	16	0.7	16	8.2	16	0.8
5	27	5.3	27	8.3	27	9.7

A. L. Lewis Elementary - 2941

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	20	-2.5	20	-3.2		
2	38	-5.4	37	-0.3		
3	45	1.1	43	-1.6		
4	42	-4.5	41	1.8	42	-2.0

Liberty City Elementary - 2981

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	17	1.4	18	3.1		
2	7	-6.8	7	1.2		
3	9	1.9	9	5.2		
4	16	1.6	15	-2.3	15	-1.3
5	11	-8.2	9	-3.2	11	-3.7
6	29	1.1	27	-3.6	30	-0.2

Little River Elementary - 3021

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	63	6.4	63	4.5		
2	75	4.1	78	8.1		
3	6	4.5	65	6.4		
4	55	3.3	56	-5.2	56	-2.1
5	56	-1.4	56	5.4	53	2.8

Lorah Park Elementary - 3041

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	19	-5.1	19	5.6		
2	14	-5.4	12	-11.6		
3	17	7.4	17	5.8		
4	17	-1.7	17	10.1	17	1.8
5	35	0.3	35	16.8	35	1.8
6	4	0.0	4	-3.4	4	3.1

Ludlam Elementary - 3061

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	8	9.7	8	16.5		
2	13	1.7	14	-0.4		
3	7	5.0	6	3.6		
4	12	13.9	12	7.8	11	11.4
5	10	1.0	7	1.3	10	-3.4
6	9	2.3	8	-7.8	8	2.0

Meadowlane Elementary - 3141

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	6	9.8	6	-1.1		
2	12	5.6	12	7.9		
3	14	5.2	13	4.4		
4	11	1.8	11	3.9	11	-4.2
5	41	6.5	41	7.0	41	0.8

Melrose Elementary - 3181

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
4	27	-6.4	26	-7.9	27	-11.5
5	62	3.5	62	5.4	62	-0.6
6	49	4.5	50	5.8	49	0.4

Miami Gardens Elementary - 3241

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	3	-0.2	3	6.8		
2	8	4.7	8	-5.7		
3	14	4.8	14	1.4		
4	18	1.0	18	-0.1	18	1.4
5	10	3.3	10	8.2	10	5.4
6	15	0.1	15	-2.7	15	2.2

Miami Heights Elementary - 3261

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	1	18.3	1	17.2		
2	2	-7.2	2	11.5		
3	6	8.6	6	-10.9		
4	3	3.7	4	8.8	4	1.6
5	1	-1.4	1	6.5	1	24.0
6	4	13.7	4	2.3	4	0.7

Miami Park Elementary - 3301

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	11	7.4	11	-1.3		
2	24	-4.3	23	-2.3		
3	29	-1.9	29	0.7		
4	38	-2.4	39	2.2	39	10.0
5	36	2.2	36	3.1	36	3.5
6	58	5.2	58	2.7	58	1.7

Milam Elementary - 3421

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	2	4.2	2	2.8		
3	5	-2.2	5	-1.1		
4	5	1.1	5	0.8	5	1.4
5	9	-2.3	9	-0.8	9	4.0
6	7	-0.3	7	5.6	7	7.8

Miramar Elementary - 3461

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
4	41	-2.0	42	-0.6	40	-8.5
5	40	0.6	40	0.3	40	-1.9
6	54	0.6	54	3.9	54	0.4

Morningside Elementary - 3501

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	5	3.6	5	-4.5		
3	6	1.1	6	-0.7		
4	5	1.5	5	-5.3	5	4.2
5	13	-4.6	12	5.0	12	-3.4
6	2	2.6	2	0.3	2	4.2

R. R. Moton Elementary - 3541

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
5	17	-3.8	18	1.7	19	8.9
6	16	2.6	15	1.5	16	1.2

Myrtle Grove Elementary - 3581

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	12	6.0	11	20.4		
2	4	1.7	4	5.3		
3	15	6.6	15	2.6		
4	13	-2.4	14	-8.5	14	-7.1
5	30	6.2	30	-5.9	31	-3.0
6	19	-1.0	19	-9.3	18	-3.4

Naranja Elementary - 3621

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	15	-11.7	16	-5.6		
2	2	-14.2	3	-1.3		
3	20	4.3	20	4.5		
4	19	3.2	20	0.4	20	0.6
5	15	6.2	14	3.0	15	0.3

Natural Bridge Elementary - 3661

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1			1	0.7		
2	4	-7.5	4	3.6		
3	1	-10.2	1	-2.9		
5	1	-8.5	1	5.1	1	-2.9

North Carol City Elementary - 3781

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	24	15.1	24	16.1		
2	11	-6.4	13	-10.3		
3	10	4.7	9	6.0		
4	17	-3.8	17	-4.0	18	-10.4
5	30	-1.8	30	3.5	31	0.9
6	19	4.9	20	11.2	19	7.3

North County Elementary - 3821

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	18	1.6	19	4.7		
2	3	-12.5	1	-9.5		
3	13	-1.3	14	7.4		
4	14	-1.5	14	0.8	14	0.2
5	6	-4.7	6	-1.9	6	5.2
6	9	2.0	9	-0.2	9	2.1

North Hialeah Elementary - 3901

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
2	2	-1.5	2	-7.6		
3	9	2.0	9	-0.7		
4	3	-3.3	3	-7.5	3	8.6
5	5	-0.3	5	15.0	5	7.2
6	8	-4.5	8	-3.2	8	-11.5

North Twin Lakes Elementary - 3981

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	1	9.4	1	1.5		
2	2	-2.7	2	-10.7		
3	5	-2.0	5	-17.4		
5	4	1.6	4	1.1	4	7.7
6	4	6.8	4	0.9	3	10.1

Olinda Elementary - 4071

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	26	15.4	26	-6.3		
2	22	4.6	22	7.7		
3	15	0.8	15	-1.6		
4	18	-5.9	18	-7.9	18	-4.3
5	15	-5.7	15	-0.7	14	-11.9
6	12	-4.9	12	1.0	13	6.2

Olympia Heights Elementary - 4091

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
2	2	-3.7	2	8.5		
3	3	0.7	3	-6.2		
6	4	7.3	4	0.6	4	-4.7

Opa Locka Elementary - 4121

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	35	8.7	34	12.7		
2	13	-8.2	13	3.1		
3	27	1.3	27	-1.4		
4	25	-3.6	25	-2.3	25	-0.6
5	29	-2.9	28	1.1	29	6.0
6	17	2.4	17	-1.8	17	4.3

Orchard Villa Elementary - 4171

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	35	9.9	35	-1.0		
2	28	3.3	27	2.6		
3	32	1.4	32	1.9		
4	48	-4.1	48	-1.6	48	-5.6
5	35	-0.4	35	6.0	35	6.9
6	44	2.1	42	-0.6	44	2.1

Palm Lakes Elementary - 4241

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	1	0.0	1	11.8		
2	4	1.6	4	1.4		
3	8	0.2	8	7.5		
5	1	-4.6	1	-2.2	1	-8.2
6	6	2.1	5	-3.9	5	-1.8

Palm Springs Elementary - 4261

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
3	3	3.4	3	-2.6		
4	3	4.8	3	6.9	3	-2.6
5	2	-1.7	2	9.7	2	7.9
6	3	6.3	3	-0.9	3	2.6

Parkview Elementary - 4301

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	14	1.5	14	7.8		
2	13	-6.7	14	-4.1		
3	11	-1.3	11	-8.2		
4	16	4.8	16	0.8	16	11.5
5	14	-1.6	14	2.8	14	4.0
6	21	4.1	21	-1.7	20	6.5

Parkway Elementary - 4341

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	1	-6.6	1	11.8		
2	3	-1.9	3	-7.8		
3	3	4.6	3	2.8		
4	1	-4.3	1	13.7	1	-22.2
5	2	-10.4	2	6.5	2	2.4
6	7	-1.8	7	-2.2	7	8.2

Perrine Elementary - 4381

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	1	-16.3	1	-15.9		
2	1	-5.8	2	-0.1		
3	3	10.7	4	3.0		
4	4	5.0	3	-3.4	4	-1.6

Kelsey Pharr Elementary - 4401

Grade Level	Reading		Mathematics		Language	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
4	55	1.7	47	4.7	51	2.3
5	70	1.7	67	2.8	70	-1.1
6	76	5.4	75	4.6	77	2.0

Pine Villa Elementary - 4461

Grade Level	Reading		Mathematics		Language	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	32	5.7	32	-3.0		
2	16	-7.2	15	-7.2		
3	14	-3.3	14	-18.7		
4	44	-5.1	41	-7.7	44	-8.7
5	48	1.9	49	6.3	47	-4.6
6	28	1.0	28	4.3	28	1.1

Poinciana Park Elementary - 4501

Grade Level	Reading		Mathematics		Language	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	33	3.4	32	-4.1		
2	23	-6.0	23	-2.1		
3	29	6.6	29	13.8		
4	31	-6.6	30	-4.5	31	-5.9
5	29	-5.0	30	1.9	30	2.4
6	35	-4.5	35	-4.0	35	0.1

Thena Crowder Elementary - 2531

Grade Level	Reading		Mathematics		Language	
	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
1	11	6.5	11	7.1		
2	11	-7.4	11	-5.3		
3	8	3.7	8	-0.7		

Rainbow Park Elementary - 4541

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	13	-0.8	14	-1.7		
2	11	-1.9	11	9.3		
3	11	1.2	11	1.8		
4	13	1.5	13	-0.2	13	1.2
5	21	6.2	21	-1.2	21	4.0
6	24	-0.6	24	-3.5	25	-0.4

Redondo Elementary - 4611

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	1	-23.4	1	-4.6		
2	6	-10.6	6	-3.8		
3	3	-0.1	3	-11.0		
4	4	2.5	3	0.7	4	5.4
5	5	0.5	6	4.6	6	2.9

Richmond Elementary - 4651

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
4	7	9.4	7	3.6	7	8.1
5	8	0.3	8	-0.1	8	-2.9
6	11	9.0	11	12.5	10	2.7

Riverside Elementary - 4681

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
4	77	-3.5	76	-3.2	75	-0.9
5	71	-0.1	69	-2.4	69	2.4
6	82	-3.1	81	-0.1	77	1.1

Santa Clara Elementary - 4841

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	29	3.2	32	4.2		
2	39	1.7	41	5.4		

Scott Lake Elementary - 4881

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	2	3.1	3	11.5		
2	1	-9.5	1	-20.9		
4	3	5.6	3	2.0	3	3.8
5	5	-2.3	5	2.0	5	10.6
6	5	8.6	5	11.9	5	0.3

Seminole Elementary - 4921

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	5	2.9	5	11.4		
2	1	-11.2	1	-2.5		
4	3	7.0	3	3.5	3	-18.3
5	3	5.3	3	14.8	2	-5.4
6	3	-10.0	3	-0.9	3	5.9

Shadowlawn Elementary - 4961

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	45	-3.7	45	-7.6		
2	26	-6.2	26	-6.3		
3	15	2.6	16	-3.6		
4	35	6.2	36	10.3	36	5.3
6	1	-4.6	1	18.4	1	-8.8

Shenandoah Elementary - 5001

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
2	1	2.0	1	-22.2		
3	4	8.9	2	5.2		
4	7	5.5	8	1.5	8	0.0
5	4	7.0	4	14.3	4	9.6
6	6	6.1	7	5.4	7	0.9

Silver Bluff Elementary - 5041

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
3	2	9.3	2	10.7		
4	1	-1.0	1	-7.0	1	-7.0
5	3	7.2	3	14.8	3	15.2
6	3	-0.4	3	-1.0	3	-5.4

Skyway Elementary - 5081

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	2	-14.7	2	-31.6		
2	2	-15.8				
3	3	-0.1	3	-4.9		
4	4	10.0	4	13.8	4	4.3
5	7	1.7	7	2.2	8	0.5
6	3	3.7	3	-2.8	3	-7.8

South Hialeah Elementary - 5201

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	2	-9.2	2	-0.5		
2	5	1.1	6	11.0		
3	18	9.7	18	8.0		
4	16	7.0	14	0.6	15	-5.9
5	24	5.8	24	6.7	24	8.7
6	19	1.3	17	1.9	19	0.7

South Miami Elementary - 5241

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	4	-7.9	4	10.0		
2	1	-3.3	1	1.2		
3	2	16.0	2	8.6		
4	1	16.4	1	6.4		
5	2	0.3	2	10.7	2	7.5
6	2	-1.5	2	20.7	2	1.6

South Miami Heights Elementary - 5281

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
2	7	-12.8	7	-5.0		
3	8	3.7	8	-2.9		
4	6	-8.3	7	-0.5	7	7.4
5	2	1.0	2	-2.4	2	14.7
6	6	1.2	6	4.0	6	2.5

Southside Elementary - 5321

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	1	-23.3	1	-15.4		
2	3	-1.3	3	1.6		
3	5	-2.7	5	-5.3		
4	11	2.8	9	3.6	11	2.8
5	11	0.9	11	-2.1	11	-1.3
6	12	0.4	12	3.2	12	2.5

Sylvania Heights Elementary - 5441

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
2	2	-1.5	2	-9.6		
3	1	-2.4	2	-4.9		
4	4	10.4	4	11.6	4	1.5
5			1	6.4	1	7.2
6	2	-1.9	3	-3.5	3	-4.9

F. S. Tucker Elementary - 5561

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	9	9.3	9	13.1		
2	5	3.3	5	-4.5		
3	9	2.5	9	7.0		
4	12	-2.8	12	1.1	12	-4.9
5	10	3.2	10	5.6	10	-1.9
6	13	2.7	13	2.6	13	1.7

Twin Lakes Elementary - 5601

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	1	-1.7	1	18.3		
3	2	2.8	2	6.5		
4					1	-9.7
5	2	-0.8	2	-10.1	2	7.0
6	6	-1.4	6	6.2	6	3.5

Mae Walters Elementary - 5711

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
2	12	1.2	12	4.0		
3	9	1.9	9	1.0		
4	11	-0.6	9	-0.9	11	-4.7
5	22	2.9	22	8.3	22	5.9
6	13	7.3	13	5.3	13	4.7

West Homestead Elementary - 5791

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	22	12.3	21	8.5		
2	15	-8.9	19	-6.5		
3	27	5.9	28	-0.9		
4	29	1.1	26	-3.5	28	-7.4
5	20	0.0	20	1.1	21	-10.1
6	1	-1.0	1	0.0	1	21.7

West Little River Elementary - 5861

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
4	52	-3.7	51	-5.6	52	-8.7
5	83	0.0	81	4.1	79	-2.9
6	83	3.7	83	0.7	84	-5.3

Westview Elementary - 5901

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	11	7.2	11	-2.9		
2	7	10.1	7	12.1		
3	26	8.2	26	5.4		
4	24	0.4	24	-3.5	23	-2.3
5	31	2.1	31	3.7	31	6.9
6	20	3.4	21	12.9	21	7.2

Wheatley Elementary - 5931

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	12	-5.9	12	12.9		
2	18	-8.2	17	-5.7		
3	34	8.0	35	7.9		
4	10	-5.7	9	-8.6	9	-19.3
5	25	1.1	24	6.6	24	-2.0
6	24	2.1	24	1.8	24	-2.2

Nathan Young Elementary - 5971

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	7	-13.2	8	-11.9		
2	21	-5.4	21	3.0		
3	30	2.3	31	-4.2		
4	14	1.8	14	-4.1	14	-2.5
5	26	7.5	26	0.2	26	3.4
6	21	6.3	21	4.0	21	2.5

Allapattah Junior High - 6011

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	37	7.7	57	2.5
8	24	7.1	37	2.5

Brownsville Junior High - 6031

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	46	12.6	59	6.3
8	82	12.2	84	1.4
9	36	17.3	53	7.6

Campbell Drive Middle School - 6061

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
6	68	2.6	68	-1.4
7	41	7.5	51	-0.1
8	23	4.3	26	-4.7

Carol City Junior High - 6051

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	54	10.1	72	0.2
8	74	9.2	87	0.1

Carver Junior High - 6071

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	31	10.8	39	-2.7

Citrus Grove Junior High - 6091

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
6	24	1.4	24	0.5
7	58	7.5	65	3.0
8	34	1.9	37	-0.7
9	1	0.0	1	12.1

C. R. Drew Junior High - 6141

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	112	3.7	145	2.0
8	94	6.0	104	-2.5

Henry Filer Junior High - 6171

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	41	11.3	51	3.5
8	52	14.9	55	1.2
9	18	14.4	31	6.1

Hialeah Junior High - 6231

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	25	7.9	31	1.3
8	38	8.8	43	2.3
9	25	13.3	41	4.0

Homestead Junior High - 6251

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
6	47	3.4	43	-2.5
7	57	3.3	62	1.9
8	36	7.1	43	1.9

Thomas Jefferson Junior High - 6281

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	17	11.4	21	6.2
8	37	14.0	41	-0.4
9	14	7.1	21	4.7

Kinloch Park Junior High - 6331

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
6	12	3.8	12	-6.9
7	33	10.9	44	2.9
8	23	12.0	32	1.9
9	13	14.5	31	7.3

Lake Stevens Junior High - 6351

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	55	9.4	77	1.4
8	65	10.5	82	0.6

Robert E. Lee Junior High - 6371

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	29	11.5	38	0.1
8	41	15.0	43	0.8

Madison Junior High - 6391

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	77	7.7	86	1.4
8	50	4.9	68	-1.4
9	31	9.7	54	3.4

Horace Mann Junior High - 6411

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
6	45	1.1	45	-2.5
7	91	8.7	120	5.5
8	55	7.3	68	3.8
9	1	0.5	1	2.8

Mays Junior High - 6431

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	19	8.8	25	2.1
8	21	4.1	27	-0.5
9	7	19.0	25	3.2

Miami Edison Middle - 6481

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
5	65	2.3	66	-0.2
6	60	-2.8	58	-5.2
7	76	10.2	109	5.2
8	100	8.0	113	-0.3

Miami Springs Junior High - 6521

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	27	11.3	47	2.9
8	53	10.1	66	2.3
9	49	12.1	83	4.3

Nautilus Junior High - 6541

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	60	14.8	75	2.9
8	43	12.5	56	0.6

North Dade Junior High - 6591

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	54	8.2	64	1.4
8	42	7.1	53	-0.2
9	25	7.7	48	5.4

Parkway Junior High - 6721

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	35	13.1	53	0.3
8	62	16.5	70	0.5
9	19	16.1	34	7.1

Riviera Junior High - 6801

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	15	11.3	20	2.5
8	24	8.3	29	-5.1
9	22	19.9	27	9.8

Shenandoah Junior High - 6841

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	27	9.0	31	-0.9
8	24	11.8	41	1.2
9	9	1.3	16	2.7

South Miami Junior High - 6881

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	24	7.5	27	-1.3
8	28	10.5	32	3.0
9	10	7.8	13	3.2

W. R. Thomas Junior High - 6901

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	37	10.1	44	3.1
8	35	8.0	36	-2.8
9	27	11.5	33	7.4

B. T. Washington Junior High - 6911

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	48	9.4	54	1.4
8	10	8.8	16	1.5
9	6	11.5	10	11.1

Westview Junior High - 6981

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	62	4.6	81	2.1
8	67	4.7	87	2.5
9	36	6.0	53	7.7

American Senior High - 7011

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	51	9.3	97	3.6
10	26	11.3	63	7.6
11	2	1.2		

Homestead Senior High - 7151

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	31	7.7	45	-0.4
10	17	4.8	42	4.5

Miami Beach Senior High - 7201

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	34	10.5	56	5.0
10	28	10.9	44	5.8

Miami Carol City Senior High - 7231

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	69	7.0	110	3.5
10	58	10.8	100	6.3
11	2	11.0	1	0.0

Miami Central Senior High - 7251

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	21	9.1	3	-16.5
10	57	9.5	101	4.1

Miami Edison Senior High - 7301

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	72	3.3	126	3.5
10	63	7.8	94	7.4
11			2	5.3

Miami Jackson Senior High - 7341

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	59	8.4	83	5.1
10	51	10.2	87	6.3

Miami Norland Senior High - 7381

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
10	15	8.2	28	3.2
11			1	-4.3

Miami Northwestern Senior High - 7411

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	70	9.1	124	6.8
10	87	9.1	137	5.6
11			1	-14.4

Miami Senior High - 7461

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	24	8.7	38	4.8
10	47	10.1	68	6.0

Miami Springs Senior High - 7511

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
10	28	8.9	42	3.1

South Dade Senior High - 7701

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	27	8.2	40	1.4
10	20	9.7	36	11.1
11	1	5.6	1	12.7

South Miami Senior High - 7721

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
10	24	7.7	40	6.3

Miami Southridge Senior High - 7731

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
10	16	8.7	48	2.2

COPE-North - 8121

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	1	10.1	1	0.0
8	2	6.0	2	-0.6
10	2	6.5	2	0.6
11	5	2.2	4	2.3

COPE-South - 8131

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
7	1	-14.0		
9	2	13.3	5	3.8
10	3	-2.8	4	0.7
11	1	-17.5		

Jan Mann-North - 8101

Grade Level	Number Tested	NCE Gain	Number Tested	NCE Gain
6	1	-9.4		
7	4	-2.5	3	15.8
8	35	-2.0	27	-7.6
9	1	10.5	1	0.0

J.R.E. Lee-Opportunity South - 2861

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
6	2	-14.8	2	-15.2
7	5	3.8	4	3.8
8	6	5.7	8	-3.0

Mac Arthur-North - 7254

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	9	3.2	13	-5.2
10	9	8.9	6	-4.6
11	7	-1.9	4	7.5

Mac Arthur-South - 7631

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain
9	3	-10.5	2	-4.2
10	3	6.6	3	-6.1
11	4	4.5	3	0.3

Corpus Christi - 8002

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	7	14.9	7	9.1		
2	7	4.3	7	-3.4		
3	12	1.2	10	7.7		
4	3	-11.9	3	-6.4	3	-7.2
5	6	6.1	6	-0.2	6	10.5
6	13	9.0	13	8.1	13	-1.9
8	3	10.6	5	-5.5		

Holy Redeemer - 8004

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	4	32.8	4	6.3		
2	6	-1.7	6	4.4		
3	8	1.5	8	-3.6		
4	3	7.9	3	-10.0	3	-4.9
5	12	1.4	12	7.3	12	-4.9
6	9	16.5	9	10.1	9	7.1
7	6	4.4	11	6.9		
8	12	8.5	18	-6.2		

Immaculate Conception - 8005

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	2	0.5	2	-6.8		
2	1	-1.4	1	9.6		
3	3	13.8	3	2.2		
4	3	-6.3	3	-19.2	3	-13.4
5	2	5.9	2	1.7	2	16.1
6	3	0.8	3	-11.8	2	8.6
7	3	-4.1	3	3.7	2	8.6

Our Lady of Perpetual Help - 8006

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
3	2	2.8	2	-1.0		
4	2	10.5	2	8.0	2	8.6
5	1	-6.4	1	-6.2	1	-2.8
6	4	6.1	4	8.2	4	4.4
7	2	17.9	3	5.6		
8	1	27.3	3	6.2		

Sacred Heart - 8007

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	6	-8.3	6	-0.4		
2	3	25.6	3	5.5		
3	4	7.2	4	12.2		
4	3	-1.4	3	-10.8	3	-12.3
5	1	11.9	1	3.5	1	-21.1
6	3	1.3	3	-5.0	3	-9.0
7			2	5.2		
8	2	-2.7	2	2.5		

St. Francis Xavier - 8008

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	5	-9.2	5	0.7		
2	1	-4.8	1	-14.8		
3	5	7.3	5	-0.7		
4	4	0.7	4	-14.1	4	-17.5
5	3	10.5	3	-4.4	3	1.1
6	3	8.6	3	5.4	3	3.6

St. John the Apostle - 8010

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	9	4.9	9	2.7		
2	5	3.3	5	-2.1		
3	6	-4.6	6	-0.3		
4	8	-8.2	8	-8.1	8	-17.8
5	20	-2.6	20	-4.6	20	-8.5
6	14	4.0	14	-1.7	14	-3.2
7	5	5.7	7	7.7		
8	5	12.7	6	3.8		

St. Monica - 8012

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
1	6	-0.7	6	4.3		
2	3	-7.2	3	0.9		
3	8	-0.6	8	7.6		
4	3	6.5	3	11.4	3	15.0
5	9	4.8	9	4.6	9	8.0
6	6	6.4	6	2.4	6	1.1
7	2	4.5	3	5.4		
8	2	12.1	2	-0.6		

Sts. Peter and Paul - 8013

Grade Level	Reading Number Tested	Reading NCE Gain	Mathematics Number Tested	Mathematics NCE Gain	Language Number Tested	Language NCE Gain
7	7	18.4				
8	7	14.6				

APPENDIX F

ECIA, Chapter 1 Survey Instruments With Results

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
ECIA, CHAPTER I
ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY N=111

Elementary 70.3% Secondary 24.3% Alternative 5.4%

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following statements by circling the number below the phrase which most accurately reflects your feeling about that statement.

A. PLANNING

1. The documents regarding the Chapter I guidelines and regulations were easy to understand and sufficient for assisting administrators with the planning of their Chapter I program.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.8%	5.4%	3.6%	11.7%	61.3%	16.2%

2. The information concerning the various Chapter I classroom models was clear and helped facilitate the planning of your Chapter I program.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	4.5%	2.7%	15.3%	64.0%	13.5%

3. The statements regarding the appropriate allocation of LEA and Chapter I staff were easy to interpret.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	10.8%	7.2%	17.1%	52.3%	12.6%

4. From the information provided, I clearly understood the policies regarding the handling of Chapter I materials (e.g. who is allowed to use them, how they should be stored, etc.)

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	2.7%	2.7%	8.1%	59.5%	27.0%

5. The time allotment for turning in Chapter I proposals (presented in the planning documents) was sufficient.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
3.7%	11.1	6.5%	19.4%	54.6%	4.6%

6. The Area Principals' meeting(s) offer useful information concerning the Chapter I program.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	17.9%	7.5%	20.8%	44.3%	9.4%

7. The communication between my school and the Chapter I Project Manager during the planning process was adequate.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
2.8%	2.8%	4.7%	15.9%	52.3%	21.5%

8. Briefly describe any problems experienced while developing this year's (1984-85) Chapter I program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Place an (X) on the line to the right of each of the areas in which you and/or your staff experienced difficulty.

_____

a. determining the most appropriate classroom models 6.3%

b. obtaining teacher involvement in the planning of the program 9.0%

c. obtaining parental involvement in the planning of the program 59.5%

d. ascertaining which students were eligible for Chapter I services 27.0%

e. developing a plan to provide the appropriate reading and math services for <u>all</u> eligible students 26.1%

f. developing appropriate articulation procedures to facilitate communication between the Chapter I funded teachers, the LEA funded teachers and the Chapter I - funded paraprofessionals 10.8%

g. selecting appropriate instructional systems 6.3%

h. other (please describe): 2.7%

_____

_____

9. Briefly describe the rationale employed to select the Chapter I classroom(s) model(s) you eventually used:

_____

_____

_____

10. The Chapter I planning process is basically an effective procedure.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.9%	7.3%	5.5%	20.0%	59.6%	6.4%

11. The Chapter I planning process is generally an efficient procedure.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	10.4%	5.7%	20.8%	58.5%	4.7%

12. State any suggestions you may have which could potentially improve the Chapter I planning process:

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. By following the Chapter I planning guidelines, I/we adequately anticipated most, if not all, problems that eventually occurred in the fall of 1984 as I/we instituted our Chapter I program.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
5.5%	8.3%	5.5%	23.9%	50.5%	6.4%

B. IMPLEMENTATION

1. I experienced few if any problems recruiting suitable personnel (teachers and aides) for the Chapter I program.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
12.6%	9.9%	10.8%	15.3%	40.5%	10.8%

2. I encountered few, if any, difficulties devising instructional schedules for my Chapter I personnel (teachers and aides).

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
8.1%	11.7%	9.9%	17.1%	45.0%	8.1%

3. I confronted few, if any, problems creating teaching schedules for my LEA funded teachers.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
3.8%	7.7%	7.7%	16.3%	51.9%	12.5%

4. I experienced few, if any, obstacles scheduling eligible students for Chapter I instructional services.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
5.5%	9.1%	11.8%	20.9%	46.4%	6.4%

5. The physical facilities of my school are adequate to meet the needs of my Chapter I program.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
13.6%	11.8%	2.7%	15.5%	42.7%	13.6%

6. The assistance provided to my school by the Chapter I T.S.A. is sufficient.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
4.7%	3.7%	4.7%	13.1%	43.0%	30.8%

7. My Chapter I program has sufficient instructional materials to meet the needs of my Chapter I students.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.9%	2.8%	7.3%	16.4%	57.8%	13.8%

8. Generally, I feel positive about the Chapter I program's strict emphasis on basic skills.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
4.6%	2.8%	4.6%	8.3%	43.5%	36.1%

If not, briefly describe any reservations you have regarding this policy:

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. My Chapter I personnel easily transferred knowledge they obtained at in-service sessions (e.g., TMP, RS/VP, etc.) into teaching methodologies.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
2.9%	5.7%	6.7%	18.1%	53.3%	13.3%

10. The scheduling of Chapter I inservice workshops provided sufficient opportunity for my Chapter I personnel to participate.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
4.8%	8.6%	10.5%	18.1%	48.6%	9.5%

11. My Chapter I staff could benefit from more inservice training.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.9%	5.6%	8.3%	18.5%	44.4%	22.2%

a. List the areas in which Chapter I staff would benefit from more in-service training:

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Generally, the Chapter I program appears to positively influence its participants' math achievement.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
4.6%	1.9%	16.7%	65.7%	11.0%	0.0%

13. Generally, the Chapter I program appears to positively influence its participants' reading achievement.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	3.7%	1.9%	17.6%	64.8%	12.0%

14. Generally, the Chapter I program appears to positively influence its participants' writing skills.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	5.6%	2.8%	25.0%	59.3%	7.4%

For elementary schools only (questions 15, 16, 17, 18)

15. My school's Chapter I budget allocation provides sufficient monies for me to maintain the mandated student teacher ratio.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.3%	6.5%	11.7%	9.1%	55.8%	15.6%

16. The Chapter I mandate stipulating the teaching of reading, writing, and mathematics and the teaching of basic skills through content areas (e.g. science, social studies, etc) presented few, if any, problems for my Chapter I and LEA teachers.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.4%	8.1%	14.9%	18.9%	51.4%	5.4%

17. Basically, I feel positive about the Chapter I program's grading policies.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	3.9%	10.4%	19.5%	57.1%	9.1%

18. Two teachers working in the same classroom (each serving 16 Chapter I students) generally works well.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
27.1%	15.7%	14.3%	20.0%	21.4%	1.4%

19. I experienced few, if any, problems complying with the various components of the Chapter I guidelines.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
2.9%	5.9%	2.0%	21.6%	59.8%	7.8%

Place a check to the right of each component which elicited compliance difficulties.

a.	providing services for all eligible students	22.7%
b.	maintaining a 16:1 pupil-teacher ratio (elementary only)	21.8%
c.	obtaining sufficient materials	14.5%
d.	securing an adequate number of trained aides	40.9%
e.	hiring teachers on time	23.4%
f.	obtaining test scores to determine students' eligibility for Chapter I	55.0%
g.	implementing appropriate models	9.9%
h.	obtaining sufficient monies to serve all eligible students	20.7%
i.	maintaining the appropriate number of students who work in a small group with an aide	23.4%
j.	serving all students for the stipulated amount of time	27.9%
k.	serving all students for the stipulated amount of time	7.2%

20. The program documents regarding the utilization of ECIA, Chapter I personnel are clear and concise.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.0%	3.8%	1.9%	15.2%	66.7%	11.4%

ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

Planning

Question 8. Briefly describe any problems experienced while developing this year's (1984-85) Chapter 1 program.

1 Lateness of knowing whether or not the school would be designated Chapter 1 (1 secondary)

1 Secondary funding is not sufficient (1 secondary)

4 Problem in scheduling resource students for 35 minutes (4 elementary)

2 Unrealistic for project managers to expect (Staff Resource) aides to be in operation during the first week of school (2 elementary)

3 Workshops for teacher aide (2 secondary, 1 elementary)

2 Workshops for new personnel to the program (2 elementary)

1 Workshops for changing attitudes of teachers who were not prepared to teach Chapter 1 students (1 elementary)

3 Difficult to hire qualified hourly personnel for Chapter 1 program (3 elementary)

2 Difficult to hire Chapter 1 teachers (2 elementary)

5 Continued changes in criteria for placement causes inefficiency with scheduling (2 secondary , 3 elementary)

13 Late arrival of test scores presents a problem between project participation and actual student participation as well as a problem with scheduling (2 secondary, 11 elementary)

1 The program needs to be explained better to alternative school's principal (1 alternative)

2 First grade placement test (reading) is too easy (2 elementary)

2 Poor T .A. support (2 elementary)

Planning (continued)

- 1 Administering placement test to students without test scores (1 elementary)
- 2 Massive movement of furniture throughout school - desk, files should be only in Chapter 1 class, not LEA (2 elementary)
- 2 Staff allocation for students needing a resource aide should be projected before shortages occur (2 elementary)
- 1 Part-time personnel with alternating scheduling is a problem with articulation (1 elementary)
- 2 The formula used to determine the number of locally-funded teachers for Chapter 1 seems to be unfair (2 elementary)
- 1 Matching LEA/Chapter 1 teachers is not clearly explained in the document (1 elementary)
- 2 No guarantee that monies will be received for some of our students due to the fact that we serve a highly mobile population (2 elementary)
- 1 When only one Chapter 1 class exists in a particular grade ESOL I must be placed there (1 elementary)
- 1 Remedial students must be spread throughout all grades but sometimes even if you have the number of youngsters for a teacher it is impossible to combine them (1 elementary)
- 1 30:1 ratio with the aide has seriously affected our staff and academically hurt the students of our school (1 secondary)
- 1 Getting part-time aides (1 secondary)
- 1 Inadequate funds (1 alternative)

Planning (continued)

Question 12. State any suggestions you may have which could potentially improve the Chapter 1 planning process.

_1_ More inservice for Chapter 1 personnel (1 elementary)

_1_ Increase secondary funding (1 secondary)

_1_ Early identification of funds (1 secondary)

_5_ More input from principals (1 secondary, 4 elementary)

_1_ Cut paperwork (1 elementary)

_1_ True involvement of Chapter 1 personnel (1 elementary)

_1_ Changing of criteria every year (1 elementary)

_2_ Avoid moving furniture and equipment in the middle of the school year (2 elementary)

_1_ Reduce time for planning (1 elementary)

_2_ Use 25:1 ratio with a teacher aide in each Chapter 1 class - establish lower ratio for secondary students (2 secondary)

_1_ Cut-off day for new arrivals (1 elementary)

_3_ Go back to 15:1 ratio (3 secondary)

_8_ Receiving test scores prior to planning for the upcoming school year (3 secondary, 5 elementary)

ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

Implementation

Question 8. Briefly describe any reservations you have regarding he Chapter 1 program's strict emphasis on basic skills

5 Principals'/teachers' judgment to be acceptable for placement (5 elementary)

1 Workshop needed for teachers in teaching basic skills (1 elementary)

12 Science, social studies and health should be added to the Basic Skills program (2 elementary

1 Reduce paperwork (1 elementary)

1 TSA should provide only services to Chapter 1 students (1 elementary)

1 Unrealistic student selection range of scores (1 elementary)

1 Students should be afforded a comprehensive reading and writing program. Basic skills emphasis has a negative effect by reducing students reading experiences (1 elementary)

Implementation (continued)

Question 11. List the areas in which Chapter 1 staff would benefit from more inservice training.

4 RSVP (4 elementary)

4 TMP (4 elementary)

14 Language Experience/Oral Development (4 elementary)

7 Computer education (4 secondary, 3 elementary)

2 ESOL (2 elementary)

5 Affective education - how to motivate students i.e., interpersonal relations (1 secondary, 4 elementary)

2 Basic skills (2 elementary)

3 Appropriate use of teacher aides (2 secondary, 1 elementary)

5 Classroom management (4 secondary, 1 elementary)

2 Assessing learning (2 elementary)

1 Additional inservice for a new teacher (1 elementary)

1 Writing skills (1 elementary)

1 Policies and procedures in Chapter 1 program (1 elementary)

1 Techniques of basic math instruction (1 alternative)

2 Diagnostic/prescriptive teaching of reading/math (2 secondary)

1 Use of audio/visual supplementary material (1 elementary)

2 Instructional techniques for reading/math (1 secondary, 1 elementary)

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
ECIA, CHAPTER I
ELEMENTARY TEACHER SURVEY N=279

Grade level(s) _____ Number of students _____

Do you teach in a single regular-sized classroom with two teachers each with a group of approximately 16 students? 54.1% Yes 45.9% No

---

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following statements by circling the number below the phrase that most accurately describes your perception about that statement.

---

1. I experience little or no difficulty devising lesson plans focusing solely on basic skills development.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.8%	2.2%	2.9%	5.4%	53.8%	34.1%

2. The Chapter I program's emphasis on basic skills causes too many limitations and restrictions on my teaching.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
16.8%	42.3%	7.9%	16.8%	11.5%	4.7%

3. Generally, the Chapter I instructional materials (e.g. the Hoffman kits, the "blue" book, etc.) are appropriate for Chapter I students.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
3.3%	5.4%	6.5%	15.6%	54.7%	14.5%

4. The amount and variety of instructional materials provided to Chapter I personnel are sufficient.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
5.4%	17.3%	15.5%	15.5%	37.8%	8.6%

5. The classroom in which I work is suitable for teaching my students.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
11.2%	14.7%	9.4%	7.9%	30.2%	26.6%

If not, please list the problems you encountered which resulted from your classroom situation:

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. The support I receive from the Chapter I T.S.A. (teacher on special assignment) and Project Manager are sufficient.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
2.9%	6.2%	4.0%	14.9%	50.7	21.4%

7. Make an (X) in each column that applies to your experience regarding the nine areas listed below. You may check as many columns as are applicable for each area.

	Column 1 Received inservice training	Column 2 Need inservice training	Column 3 Received support materials	Column 4 Would like more support materials	Column 5 Not applicable
Test-taking strategies	26.9%	20.1%	35.5%	34.1%	6.8%
Reg. composition activities	17.6%	12.2%	30.1%	30.1%	10.4%
The use of manipulatives	11.8%	13.6%	16.1%	49.8%	7.9%
Interdisciplinary inst.	18.3%	17.6%	15.1%	21.5%	17.6%
Project Micro	22.2%	23.3%	26.2%	12.9%	12.2%
Lang. Experience approach	67.7%	5.7%	46.2%	24.7%	0.0%
Total Math Program (TMP)	55.6%	10.8%	31.2%	17.9%	13.6%
RS/VP	77.1%	5.4%	45.2%	13.3%	1.4%
Oral language development	78.5%	3.9%	48.7%	19.7%	0.7%

8. Please list any other areas in which you would like inservice training:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Inservice training is being provided at convenient times.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
4.1%	8.9%	8.9%	16.2%	54.6%	7.4%

10. The 16:1 pupil-teacher ratio is more effective for teaching Chapter I students than the typical ratio.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.1%	0.4%	0.0%	2.5%	26.2%	69.9%

11. The 16:1 pupil-teacher ratio allows me (and/or my aides) sufficient time to work with each student (or groups of students) at his/her (their) respective level(s).

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.4%	2.9%	4.3%	11.9%	43.3%	36.1%

12. The 16:1 pupil-teacher ratio allows me (and/or my aides) sufficent time to supply additional remediation to those students who need it.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
2.2%	2.2%	7.5%	17.2%	42.7%	28.3%

13. The need to have two teachers, with approximate groups of 16 students each, in a single regular-sized classroom is not harmful to instruction.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
30.2%	21.1%	12.7%	9.8%	20.0%	6.2%

14. Even if it is necessary during the 1985-86 school year to share one regular-sized classroom with another teacher, each with a group of approximately 16 students, I would prefer to continue in the Chapter 1 program.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
10.6%	9.1%	5.8%	8.4%	29.6%	36.5%

15. My students appear interested in and stimulated by the basic skills curriculum.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.7%	3.6%	4.7%	14.8%	58.1%	18.1%

16. I am very satisfied with the grading system instituted this year (1984-85) for Chapter I students.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
3.0%	4.4%	4.4%	10.3%	59.0%	18.8%

17. The full day basic skills program is an effective method for improving students' abilities in math.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.1%	1.4%	2.2%	14.8%	46.9%	33.6%

18. The full day basic skills program is an effective method for improving students' abilities in reading.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.1%	1.4%	1.8%	10.5%	46.6%	38.6%

19. The full day basic skills program is an effective method for improving students' abilities in language development.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1.4%	3.3%	6.2%	12.3%	46.4%	30.4%

20. The full day basic skills program is an effective method for improving students' abilities in writing.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.7%	1.8%	2.9%	14.2%	51.8%	28.5%

INSTRUCTIONS: Make an (X) after each activity which you think benefited from the support provided by Chapter I resources (e.g. project manager/ T.S.A. assistance, basic skills materials, inservice workshops, etc.)

21.

a.	the development of individualized educational plans	40.9%
b.	the teaching of basic skills via content area(s)	58.8%
c.	the teaching of reading	62.7%
d.	the teaching of math	54.8%
e.	the use of the language experience approach	75.6%
f.	offering incentives to students	37.3%
g.	the teaching of oral language development	76.7%

ELEMENTARY TEACHER SURVEY

Question 5. Please list the problems you encountered which resulted from your classroom situation.

12 We are crowded (we can't use filmstrips)

68 Distraction (noise level)

23 Not enough space (and storage space)

20 Restricted activities

16 Not sufficient space to have reading/learning centers

2 Furniture inadequate

1 Only one electrical outlet

1 The placement test doesn't serve its purpose in the primary grades

1 Need a textbook and content area

Question 8. Please list any other areas in which you would like inservice training.

11 Computer training

5 Language Experience Approach

6 Behavior and classroom management (discipline strategies

2 Creative writing

1 Test taking strategies

3 Motivating the slow learners

2 Reading centers

1 Mathematics

2 ESOL

1 Working with Haitian community

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
ECIA, CHAPTER I
SECONDARY AIDE SURVEY N=92

Instructions: Please respond to each of the following statements by circling the number below the phrase which most accurately reflects your feelings about that statement.

---

1. The classroom in which I work is suitable for helping my students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1%	4.3%	2.2%	9.8%	50.0%	32.6%

2. The directions and support I receive from teachers are sufficient.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	58.7%	40.2%

3. The size of the instructional groups and the duration of the sessions's allow me sufficient time to work with each student (or groups of students) at his/her respective level(s).

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.1%	4.3%	5.4%	16.3%	55.4%	17.4%

4. The articulation procedures to facilitate communication between the teachers and the Chapter I paraprofessionals are very effective.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	7.6%	69.6%	21.7%

5. The Chapter 1 program has sufficient instructional materials.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0.0%	1.1%	5.5%	12.1%	50.5%	30.8%

6. Knowledge obtained at inservice sessions was easily transferred into teaching methodologies.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0.0%	10.6%	3.5%	15.3%	61.2%	9.4%

7. I feel that I need more inservice training.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.2%	34.9%	4.7%	19.8%	27.9%	11.6%

8. Inservice training is being provided at convenient times.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
2.4%	12.2%	9.8%	11.0%	59.8%	4.9%

9. Please list areas that you feel a need for more training:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

SECONDARY AIDE SURVEY

Question 9. Please list areas that you feel a need for more training.

20 Additional computer and software training

4 Training to upgrade skills in English

1 Training in mathemetics

2 Training in classroom management techniques

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
ECIA, Chapter I
PROJECT MANAGER SURVEY N=3

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following statements by circling the number below the phrase which most accurately reflects your feeling about that statement.

---

1. The documents distributed through the Office of Federal Projects Administration, regarding the Chapter I guidelines and regulations, are easy to understand and sufficient for assisting administrators with the planning of their Chapter I programs.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	2	1

2. Little or no difficulty was encountered in the implementation of the

A. Schoolwide model

Not Applicable
1

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	0	2

B. Full-day, Self-Contained Basic Skills Model

Not Applicable
0

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	1	2

C. Staff Resource Model

Not Applicable
0

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	0	1	0	1	0

D. Homogeneous Laboratory or Classroom

Not Applicable

0

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	1	2

E. Split Laboratory or Classroom

Not Applicable

0

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	1	2

F. Extended School Day Model

Not Applicable

1

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	0	0	0	0	1

G. Pull-Out Model

Not Applicable

0

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	2	1

H. Double Dosage

Not Applicable

1

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	1	1

3. There were minimal difficulties when working with school administrators regarding the implementation of the Chapter I program.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	3	0

4. Minimal difficulty was experienced by myself or the TSAs when helping the schools choose the model(s) resulting in compliance with Chapter I guidelines regarding LEA funded class periods.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	1	1	1

5. Little or no difficulty is encountered in allocating sufficient TSA support to the Chapter I schools.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	2	1

6. Many of the schools I work with have difficulty maintaining compliance with program guidelines.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	3	0	0	0	0

7. Little or no difficulty is encountered when providing support to Chapter I schools.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	2	1

8. I encounter few, if any, difficulties in the supervision of the TSAs.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	1	2

9. Please list any problems you encountered while supporting the Chapter I programs.

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. The TSAs and I are able to provide all needed support to our Chapter I schools.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	1	1	1

11. Sufficient resources (e.g. funds, staff, materials, etc.) are available to provide all necessary inservice activities.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	1	2

12. Numerous difficulties impede the coordination of inservice activities.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	2	0	0	0	1

13. Please list any problems you encountered in planning and coordinating inservice activities.

_____

_____

_____

_____

14. Generally, the shared classroom arrangement occurring in some Chapter I classes is working very well.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	1	0	0	2

15. Cooperation and positive interactions appear to be characteristic of the relationships among the teaching staff.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	1	2

16. In the schools I am involved with, Chapter I is working effectively to promote positive changes in basic skills achievement in the students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	1	2

17. Basically, I feel positive about the program's strict emphasis on basic skills instruction.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	0	3

18. Few, if any problems impeded the dissemination of information about the project to parents and school system personnel.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	1	0	2

19. The schools I work with experience difficulties involving parents in the implementation of the basic skills program.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	0	2	0	0

20. The TSAs and I were able to increase parental involvement in the educational process of their children.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	3	0	0

21. There are few, if any, difficulties assisting in the organization and operation of the Parent Advisory Councils.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	1	2	0	0

22. Please identify other specific problems with the current Chapter I programs.

_____

_____

_____

_____

23. Recommendations for improving Chapter I: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

PROJECT MANAGER SURVEY

Question 9. Please list any problems you encountered while supporting the Chapter 1 programs.

_2 Aide time required at 35 minutes a student-rescheduling

_1 When the required number of LEA teachers is greater than the number of Chapter 1 teachers, principals are very negative

Question 13. Please list any problems you encountered in planning and coordinating inservice activities.

_1 No set aide days for this purpose i.e., planning and conducting inservice activities

_1 Aides are part-time and often do not attend inservice because they do not get paid overtime

_1 Teachers are tired when inservice is offered formally and must be given 1:1 during the day

_1 Requesting time for teachers for group sessions. As a result inservice has to be on a one to one basis

Question 22. Please identify other specific problems with the current Chapter 1 programs.

_1 Secondary aides are not providing equitable time for students

Question 23. Recommendations for improving Chapter 1.

1 It is generally felt by several of the TSAs that the organizational structure of the area Chapter 1 offices should be revamped in order to bring about more effective utilization of personnel. Perhaps, at the area level, it would prove more beneficial for specialists to be able to specialize in areas such as staff development, curriculum writing, administrative, etc.

1 To have exclusively full day basic skill classes in some few schools where we may concentrate all of our resources and efforts

1 Contingency model could be either 30 minutes or 50 minutes per child - it would help in scheduling and hiring

1 Days should be identified for county and/or area inservice activities - it would help

1 Develop form for TSAs and Project Managers to check off for monitoring - for more uniformity throughout

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
ECIA, CHAPTER I
AREA EDUCATIONAL SPECIALIST SURVEY N-11

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following statements by circling the number below the phrase which most accurately reflects your feeling about that statement.

1. The documents distributed through the Office of Federal Projects Administrations, regarding the Chapter I guidelines and regulations, were easy to understand and sufficient for assisting administrators with the planning of their Chapter I programs.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	4	0	1	5	0

2. Little or no difficulty was encountered in the implementation of the

A. Schoolwide Model

Not Applicable
5

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	3	0	3	0	0

B. Full-day, Self-Contained Basic Skills Model

Not Applicable
0

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	4	1	0	3	3

C. Staff Resource Model

Not Applicable
0

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4	0	5	0	2	0

D. Homogeneous Laboratory or Classroom

Not Applicable

4

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	3	0	2	1

E. Split Laboratory or Classroom

Not Applicable

9

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	0	0	1	0

F. Extended School Day model

Not Applicable

8

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	0	1	1	0

G. Pull-Out Model

Not Applicable

4

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	0	3	3	0

H. Double Dosage

Not Applicable

8

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	0	1	0	1

3. There were no difficulties when working with school administrators regarding the implementation of the Chapter I program.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	4	1	5	1	0

4. Generally, the schools I work with encountered little or no difficulty allocating sufficient staff to accommodate Chapter I eligible students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4	3	1	2	1	0

5. The information describing the guidelines for monitoring the Chapter I schools was clear and specific.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	1	5	5	0

6. Monitoring activities are effective in promoting appropriate diagnostic placements and student progress.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	4	0	1	4	2

7. Generally, the schools I support encountered few, if any, problems testing students in a timely manner for program eligibility.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	1	3	1	5	0

8. Student attendance is maintained at a high level in my Chapter I schools.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	2	1	7	0

9. The schools I work with have difficulty maintaining compliance with program guidelines.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	2	3	6

10. Please list the areas which caused problems with compliance.

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. I experience little or no difficulty assisting teachers in acquiring sufficient materials.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	5	0	5	1

12. Few, if any, difficulties are experienced in assisting in the development and conducting of needed inservice activities in:

A. Reading

Not Applicable

0

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4	0	0	1	4	2

B. Mathematics

Not Applicable

0

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4	0	0	1	3	3

C. Basic Skills Through the Content Areas

Not Applicable

0

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
3	1	0	1	4	2

D. Language Experience

Not Applicable

0

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
4	0	0	1	3	3

E. Project MICRO

Not Applicable

4

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	0	0	4	2

F. Oral Language Development

Not Applicable

1

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
3	0	0	1	3	3

G. Test Taking Techniques

Not Applicable

4

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	0	1	3	2

H. Writing

Not Applicable

4

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	0	1	3	2

13. Most of the Chapter I program staff I work with participate in appropriate inservice activities.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	5	3	3

14. The TSAs and project manager are able to provide all needed support to our Chapter I schools.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	4	0	2	4

15. Please list the areas in which you would like to provide more support.

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. Generally, the shared classroom arrangement occurring in some Chapter I classes is working very well.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	4	4	3	0

17. Cooperation and positive interactions appear to be characteristic of the relationships among the teaching staff.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	6	5	0

18. Basically, I feel positive about the program's strict emphasis on basic skills instruction.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	1	1	9

19. The schools I support experienced difficulties involving parents in the implementation of the basic skills program.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	1	1	3	2	4

20. In the schools I am involved with, Chapter I is working effectively to promote positive changes in basic skills achievment in the students.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	0	8	3

21. Inservice training activities would increase my effectiveness with regard to providing support and direction to my Chapter I schools.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
0	0	0	1	6	4

22. Place a check ( ) to the right of each topic listed below in which you would like further inservice training:

Classroom management techniques	6
Assertiveness skills	6
Establishing effective interpersonal relationships	3
RS/VP	1
TMP	5
The language experience approach to the teaching of basic skills via content areas	4
Oral Language Development	4
Other: (please specify) _____	0
_____	
_____	

23. Please list other specific problems you are aware of in the current Chapter I program:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

24. Recommendations for improving Chapter I: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 10. Please list the areas which caused problems with compliance.

_1_ Resource students being added throughout the school year

_1_ Securing enough classroom teachers to maintain a 16:1 pupil/teacher ratio in a schoolwide project

_1_ Inability to secure aides from central area for non-public schools

_2_ Inability to comply with staff resource model guidelines (maintaining ratio for staff resource)

_1_ Classes over 16 students

_1_ Inappropriate scheduling in secondary schools

_1_ Two teachers sharing the same room

_1_ Changing LEA to Chapter 1 teachers all year

_1_ Serving all eligible students after budget has been finalized

_2_ Securing qualified aides to service secondary schools

_1_ Consistency of directions from central office

_1_ ESOL/Chapter 1 interface

_1_ Contingency scheduling in high student mobility schools

_1_ Secondary Micro

_1_ Proper test scores for placement

Question 15. Please list the areas in which you would like to provide more support.

_1_ Oral language (explicit guidelines for teachers countywide)

Question 23. Please list other specific problems you are aware of in the current Chapter 1 program.

_1 Population increases that require reallocation of staff and students during the entire school year

_1 Two teachers sharing the same room

_1 Improve communication between area and central office

_1 The educational specialists are not prepared to deal with ESOL program implementation

_1 TSA's should meet periodically to discuss problems pertinent for countywide uniformity

_1 Change in student population causes scheduling problems in both resource and basic skills schedules

Question 24. Recommendations for improving Chapter 1.

_3 Direct communication from central office to area staff

_1 There should be a contact person in all schools responsible for Chapter 1

_1 Alternative test should be revised

_2 Improve conditions for TSA to provide school group inservices

_1 Place the Oral Language package at all grade levels (1-12)

_1 TSAs need to get copies of most memos that are sent to Chapter 1 schools (or have computers hooked up to the electronic mail

_1 After a school's budget has been exhausted, provide some written guidelines for school administrators to follow when the number of Chapter 1 eligible students exceed the amount of service the school can provide. Should there be cut-off date? A cut-off number? Please provide some clarity for these concerns.

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
ECIA, CHAPTER 1 - PARENT SURVEY

Do you have a child who participates in the Chapter 1 program? Yes 38 No 10

If yes, please place an "X" next to each type of school listed below in which you have a child who participates in the Chapter 1 program.

Public elementary 31, Public secondary 4, Alternative ___, Non-public 3

Were you made aware of your child's participation in the chapter 1 program by school personnel? Yes 34 No 4

* *

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to each of the following statements by circling the number below the phrase which most accurately reflects your feeling about that statement.

1. Generally, I like the Chapter 1 program's strict emphasis on reading, writing, and mathematics.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	35.4%	54.1%

2. Students participating in the Chapter 1 program receive homework.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
2.1%	4.2%	0.0%	4.2%	35.4%	54.1%

3. The school has given me a chance to become involved in the education of my child(ren).

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
4.3%	2.1%	0.0%	8.5%	34%	51.1%

4. The evaluation results of the Chapter 1 program have been explained to me.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
8.3%	8.3%	4.2%	2.1%	37.5%	39.6%

5. I have been given a chance to make recommendations about the Chapter 1 project.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
6.7%	13.3%	0.0%	13.3%	46.7%	20%

6. The Chapter 1 program should be in all eligible schools, even though it would result in fewer students participating at each school.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
2.1%	2.1%	2.1%	2.1%	34.1%	57.5%

7. Make an (x) in each column that applies to your experience and/or needs regarding the areas listed below.

	Received training	Need training	Not Applicable
a. Helping children at home in reading and mathematics	46%	44%	10%
b. Information about the Chapter 1 program.	54%	34%	12%
c. Conducting parent meetings and activities for parents.	35%	44%	21%
d. Other (please specify).			

8. The use of computers to help students in reading, writing, and mathematics is effective.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	12.5%	31.2%	54.2

9. At the secondary level, the provision of Chapter 1 services through the use of paraprofessionals (aides and assistants) as supplementary personnel met the needs of eligible students in reading and mathematics.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	54.8%	28.5%

10. In your opinion, how can the Chapter 1 secondary level program be improved?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

In four public elementary schools, Chapter 1 services were provided using the Schoolwide Project Model:

a. In this model, Chapter 1 instruction was provided in self-contained classrooms with a 16:1 pupil/teacher ratio to all students enrolled in the four public elementary schools with the highest percentages of students eligible for free or reduced price lunches.

b. All students received instruction in all curriculum areas based on individual student needs.

c. All students received grades in all curriculum areas in which instruction is presented i.e., basic skills, science, social studies, health and safety, enrichments, electives.

d. Diagnostic prescriptive instruction in the basic skills (language arts, reading, mathematics) is enhanced by parallel instruction emphasizing basic skills in all other subject mattter content areas (science, social studies, health, literature and expressive language).

11. The Schoolwide Project Model, as presently provided, should be continued.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	2.4%	7.3%	0.0%	39.1%	51.2%

12. State any suggestions you may have which should potentially improve the Chapter 1 planning process:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Questions 13-27 Are Only For Parents With A Child In The Public Elementary School Chapter 1 Program

In the public elementary schools, Chapter 1 services are provided using the Full-Day Self-Contained Basic Skills Model:

a. In this model, teachers instructed Chapter 1-eligible students exclusively in separate classrooms with a maximum of 16 students. Although in some instances space limitations required two teachers and 32 students to be assigned to a single classroom, each teacher was instructionally responsible for his/her specific group of students.

b. Approximately one-half of the school day was devoted to individualized instruction in reading, language arts and mathematics using a diagnostic/prescriptive approach. The remainder of the day included basic skills instruction through content areas (science, social studies, health, literature and expressive language) and instruction from specialists in physical education, music, art and other electives.

c. Since students will not receive direct instruction in objectives for social studies, science and health, report card grades were given only in the areas of language arts and mathematics plus enrichment and elective subjects.

13. My child likes participating in the full-day basic skills program described above.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
3.1%	3.1%	0.0%	9.4%	53.1%	31.3%

14. The full-day basic skills program is an effective method for improving children's reading.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	12.9%	35.5%	48.4%

15. The full-day basic skills program is an effective method for improving children's math.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	9.7%	38.7%	48.4%

16. The full-day basic skills program is an effective method for improving children's writing.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	3.2%	3.2%	12.9%	35.5%	45.2%

17. The full-day basic skills program is an effective method for improving children's language skills.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	3.3%	3.3%	13.3%	36.7%	43.3%

18. The 16:1 pupil/teacher ratio allows the teacher time to work with each student (or groups of students) at his/her (their) respective level(s).

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
3.1%	0.0%	3.1%	12.5%	34.4%	46.9

19. The 16:1 pupil/teacher ratio allows the teacher time to supply additional help to those who need it.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	9.4%	43.8%	40.6%

20. Having two teachers, with groups of 16 students each, in a single regular-sized classroom is not harmful to instruction.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
9.4%	3.1%	15.6%	9.4%	37.5%	25%

21. I am satisfied with the 16:1 pupil/teacher class ratio for Chapter 1 students.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	9.4%	9.4%	9.4%	31.2%	40.6%

22. Generally, I approve of the requirement that eligible elementary Chapter 1 students not receive direct instruction in objectives for social studies, science and health.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
16.1%	3.2%	9.7%	25.8%	22.6%	22.6%

23. The Chapter 1 requirement that the teaching of reading, writing, mathematics, and basic skills through content areas (e.g. science, social studies, etc.) presented few problems for the Chapter 1 teachers.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
6.3%	3.1%	3.1%	31.3%	40.6%	15.6%

24. I am satisfied with the grading system for Chapter 1 students.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
3.2%	3.2%	3.2%	6.5%	58.1%	25.8%

25. I receive enough direction and support from the parent aide (previously called parent liaison person, PLP).

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
13.8%	10.3%	3.5%	17.2%	48.3%	6.9%

26. The communication between the parents and the parent aide is satisfactory.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
13.3%	10%	6.7%	13.3%	43.3%	13.3%

27. The parent aide support, as presently provided, should be continued.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	40%	53.3%

PARENT SURVEY

Question 10. In your opinion, how can the Chapter 1 secondary level program be improved?

1 More workshops for parents and teachers.

3 More parental involvement, unaware of what Chapter 1 is all about.

1 Children involved in Chapter 1 should be considered equal to other children at their level.

1 By having some teacher aides in each Chapter 1 teachers' room.

1 By having more courses in social studies, science and other subjects.

1 By having more aides/assistants.

1 By having aides/assistants only at the secondary level the Chapter 1 program has been going down.

2 Better trained aides/assistants.

1 Send tests home with pupils for parents to test them; teachers should sign and grade them. Signed tests should be sent home for parents' records.

1 Many schools emphasize remediation and do not recognize students who have the ability to move ahead or do not make the effort to raise the expepectations of these students.

1 More materials.

3 Consideration of better teachers.

1 Science and social studies should be graded in all schools.

Question 12. State any suggestions you may have which should potentially improve the Chapter 1 planning process:

1 More principal involvement.

1 Students should receive social studies and science.

1 Send parents schedules of homework.

1 The planning committee should keep Parent Liason Persons in Chapter 1 where they can be of assistance.

1 Have all homework assignments signed by parents and teachers.

1 More time for teachers to teach students reading, math and writing.

1 Stimulating reading in social studies, science, religion, etc.

1 Do not rely so heavily on Stanford Achievement Test stanines to place students in Chapter 1. Many factors should be considered before labeling a child "remedial".

1 More emphasis on child's needs.

1 Teachers should work closely with the Parent Liason Person in helping prepare materials for students.

1 Additional help for the classroom teacher.

The School Board of Dade County, Florida adheres to a policy of nondiscrimination in educational programs/activities and employment and strives affirmatively to provide equal opportunity for all as required by:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended - prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex.

Age Discrimination Act of 1967, as amended - prohibits discrimination on the basis of age between 40 and 70.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 - prohibits discrimination against the handicapped,

Florida Educational Equity Act - prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin, marital status or handicap against a student or employee.

Veterans are provided re-employment rights in accordance with P.L. 93–508 (Federal) and Section 295.07, Florida Statutes, which also stipulates categorical preferences for employment.